

282.4285

Class

M155

Book

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by

EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.

DEAN 1879-1902

yas
6xx

THE
SOCIAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT
IN GREAT BRITAIN



THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO • DALLAS
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, Ltd.
TORONTO

THE SOCIAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

BY

GEORGIANA PUTNAM McENTEE, PH.D.

Instructor in History, Hunter College of the City of New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK

1927

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1927

All rights reserved

282.4208.5

M155

83339

COPYRIGHT, 1927,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and printed.
Published July, 1927.

TRANSFERRED FROM THE
YRABILL
XEROY WEN

TO
MY FATHER AND MOTHER



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

PREFACE

Social Catholicism is one of the most significant developments in the history of modern movements for social reform. It originated in the nineteenth century and is an effort on the part of public-spirited Catholics to apply Christian principles to the solution of social and economic problems, especially those created by the Industrial Revolution. The Social Catholic Movement is becoming increasingly important in the countries of Europe and the New World, and success has crowned many of the individual endeavours and organised activities of its now numerous adherents.

This account of the social reform movement amongst British Catholics was inspired by Professor Parker T. Moon's study of the Social Catholic Movement in France, and by an interest in the ideas and activities of the Catholics of Great Britain, which was first aroused through discourses given before the Catholic Library Association by the Right Rev. Joseph H. McMahon of New York City. It was my privilege to write under the direction of Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University, who has done so much to reveal the rich possibilities for exploitation in the field of social history.

I have pursued my research in the United States and in Great Britain, chiefly in the Library of Columbia University, the New York Public Library, the headquarters of the Catholic Social Guild at Oxford, and in various places in London. I have been in constant communication with the Secretary of the Catholic Social Guild, the Rev. Leo O'Hea, S.J., for whose valuable assistance, rendered with untiring patience and unfailing courtesy, I am deeply grateful. To many others, both in England and America, I am greatly indebted for encouragement and information. I wish especially to thank the Rev. Dr. J. Elliot Ross, C.S.P., Chaplain of the Newman Club of Columbia University, and Professor

David McCabe of the Department of Economics, Princeton University, for their helpful suggestions and valuable criticisms. Professor Robert Livingston Schuyler of Columbia University has kindly assisted with the task of revising the proofs.

GEORGIANA PUTNAM McENTEE.

New York City
May, 1927

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I
CHAPTER	
I. CARDINAL MANNING AS A SOCIAL REFORMER	15
Background	15
Theories on the Social Question	23
Participation in Social Reform Movements: Introduction	39
Education and Child Welfare	40
Early Interest in the Land Problem in England	49
Notes and References	51
II. MANNING IN THE THICKEST OF THE FIGHT	55
The Irish Question	55
Temperance	60
The Housing Problem and Poor Relief	68
The Dockers' Strike	71
Other Interests and Activities	76
Relations with Other Social Reformers	79
The Last Phase	87
Notes and References	89
III. ECONOMIC THEORIES AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS	94
Socialism	94
Charles Stanton Devas	102
Further Notes on English Catholics and Socialism	106
Anti-statists and Distributivists: Belloc, Chesterton, McNabb .	111
Guild Socialism	118
Communism	124
Catholics and the British Labour Party	127
Why Not a Catholic Political Party?	137
Notes and References	143
IV. THE COMING OF THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD	152
Vaughan and the End of the Century	152
The Catholic Social Guild Foreshadowed	160
The Origin of the Catholic Social Guild	173
The Production and Circulation of Social Literature	183

CHAPTER	PAGE
Study Circles and Study Schemes	189
Notes and References	194
V. THE EXPANSION OF CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION	202
Catholic Social Action on the Eve of the War	202
Carrying on in War Time and Days of Readjustment	209
Steering Clear of Shoals	221
The Catholic Workers' College	232
Distinctive Work of English Catholic Women	237
Notes and References	241
VI. FOREIGN CONTACTS AND WORLD PEACE	248
The Prestige of the Pioneers	250
Plater's Indebtedness to Continental Precedents	251
Ireland	253
Spain and Italy	255
France and Germany	258
Influence in America	259
English Catholics and International Social Action	263
First Efforts of British Catholics in behalf of International Accord	267
The Catholic Peace Association	271
Preparations for World Peace in the Midst of World War	275
The League of Nations	278
The Catholic Council for International Relations	282
Notes and References	288
CONCLUSION	296
APPENDIX A. ARCHBISHOP BAGSHAW OF NOTTINGHAM	299
APPENDIX B. CATHOLICS AND THE BRITISH GENERAL STRIKE	302
INDEX	307

THE
SOCIAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT
IN GREAT BRITAIN

THE SOCIAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

INTRODUCTION

The history of England in the sixteenth century was marked by two phenomena of great historical significance. One was an unprecedented growth in national self-consciousness, and the other—closely bound up with the first—the triumph of Protestantism. Allied to these two developments there was a third—a far-reaching economic change brought about by the spoliation of the monastic lands and the destruction of the guilds. Meanwhile the substitution of sheep-raising for tillage in many parts of England in response to the demands of the rapidly growing woollen trade had driven great numbers of country folk into the towns. These changes were among the factors in that gradual revolution of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which broke down the mediaeval basis of political economy and paved the way for modern social conditions. The Elizabethan Poor Laws were designed to cope with the hardships brought about by this transition.¹

But the greatest transformation which was wrought in English social and economic life took place in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the Industrial Revolution by the introduction of machinery enormously increased the output of goods and ushered in the factory system to replace the old domestic methods of production. Unfortunately for the working classes, this stupendous revolution synchronised with the prevalence of a spirit of individualism which, permeating every department of thought and activity, brought about a philosophy of laissez-faire in matters social and economic. The results were deplorable. Hundreds of thousands of people who had followed their means of livelihood to

the cities were overworked and underpaid, were forced to labour under conditions that beggar description, and were herded in slums of unspeakable squalor. According to the current notions, their fate was written in the logic of things and nothing could or should be done by the State to better their condition. It would not be literally true, however, to say that prevailing opinion regarded these unfortunates as doomed. They could, it was thought, help themselves; and to this end, various suggestions were made. Malthus, for example, who appraised the situation with an even more than usually pessimistic eye, offered a solution, unacceptable to many people to be sure, but nevertheless a solution of the social problems of his day.²

Meanwhile, as far as legal proscription and social ostracism could bring about its banishment, the Catholic Church had disappeared from the life of the English people. The dawn of the nineteenth century saw in Great Britain the most highly industrialised and one of the most thoroughly Protestant nations of the world. The adherents of the old religion were only a handful. They had a scanty representation among the inhabitants of the rapidly rising industrial cities, and were to be found among isolated families of the old gentry who clung with tenacity to the tenets of the ancient faith. Like their prototypes of the first three centuries of our era, they had come to be regarded, as Newman pointed out in his exquisite sermon, *The Second Spring*, as a "gens lucifuga," a people who shunned the light. But not unconnected with the sceptical and revolutionary spirit of the latter eighteenth century, the English opposition to the French Revolution in all its aspects, even in its anti-Catholic aspects, the development of a penchant for personal liberty in the early nineteenth century and the low ebb of the established religion in England during those years, there came about a reaction in the attitude of the English public toward the Catholic Church. The most onerous of the old penal laws disappeared from the statute books as the eighteenth century was drawing to a close, and in 1829 the Catholic Emancipation Act restored political rights to English Catholics.

A little later the Oxford Movement, a phase of the romantic revival, characterised as a religious movement by an awakened interest in patristic theology, led to the conversion of a number of prominent Anglicans to Roman Catholicism, among them William George Ward and John Henry Newman. The harking back to the Middle Ages meant an appreciation of an epoch when social relationships and economic conditions were not at the mercy of unbridled individualism and unlimited competition, but were held to be subject to ethical laws and local regulation. These resurrected facts could not fail to impress themselves on the course of social thought in the nineteenth century to the detriment of laissez-faire and the encouragement of public intervention.³

In 1850 the Catholic Hierarchy was restored. Pius IX abolished the system of eight Apostolic Vicariates under which the Catholics of England had been governed, and erected in their stead one Archiepiscopal, or Metropolitan, and twelve Episcopal Sees. The remnant of the Catholic Church in the land was elated, and Protestant England correspondingly apprehensive. The new Archbishop of Westminster, Dr. Wiseman, then in Rome, was raised to the Cardinalate at the same time. Born in Seville and trained in Ireland, England and Italy, he had not acquired that sense of shrinking inferiority which marked the mentality of many Catholics who had lived continuously on English soil, and consequently, he gave vent to his exultation in a pastoral letter issued to his flock *Out of the Flaminian Gate* in which he elaborated on the theme that "the greatest of blessings" had just been bestowed upon his country "by the restoration of its true Catholic hierarchical government, in communion with the See of Peter."⁴

This was quite too much for the large Protestant army already in possession of the religious field. They were not unaware that the papal letter had ignored the Anglican Establishment; and if Catholics had been indiscreet in their rejoicing, their non-Catholic compatriots were even more immoderate in their exhibition of nerves. The Pope was burned in effigy through the length and breadth of England. The pamphlet literature to which the new dispensation gave rise is interesting today as one of the many

historical instances when a panic-stricken people saw in a relatively unimportant event the harbinger of horrible disaster.⁵

The student of social history will find one significant item in the almost worthless controversy of the day. Wiseman, thrown on the defensive, issued an *Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy*. In it he envisaged the social problem. Reassuring the Anglican chapter of Westminster, who were fearful lest the new archbishop would lay claim to the riches and honours connected with the old Abbey, he said:

“—this splendid monument, its treasures of art and its fitting endowments, form not the part of Westminster which will concern me. . . . Close under the Abbey of Westminster there lie concealed labyrinths of lanes and courts and alleys and slums—nests of ignorance, vice, depravity, and crime, as well as squalor, wretchedness, and disease. . . . This is the part of Westminster which alone I could and which I shall be glad to claim and to visit as a blessed pasture in which sheep of holy Church are to be tended, in which a Bishop’s godly work has to be done. . . . If the wealth of the Abbey be stagnant and not diffusive, if it in no way rescue the neighbouring population from the depths in which it is sunk, let there be no jealousy of any one who, by whatever name, is ready to make the latter his care, without interfering with the former.”⁶

Thus did the new Archbishop of Westminster enter upon his heritage. Impelled by the exigencies of the situation to pioneer work in rehabilitating Catholicism in the minds of the English people, and interested by temperament in scholarly and cultural pursuits, he never gave more than casual attention to conditions with which his successor was to grapple with extraordinary success. Preaching in St. John’s Church, Salford, in July, 1850, he pleaded for a consideration of the needs of the poor. About a fortnight later, in the pulpit of St. George’s Church in Southwark, again urging the claims of charity, he drew a contrast between the condition of the proletariat in ancient Rome and in his day, when there existed a feeling in society which made the more for-

tunately placed acknowledge obligations to relieve poverty, sickness and distress. In 1851 in a sermon in which he declared that every age of the Church may be considered as characterised by the impression of some one of the attributes of God, he singled out those of mercy and compassion as distinguishing his own day. As far as social theory was concerned, the Cardinal when reviewing Montalembert's *St. Elizabeth of Hungary* took occasion to excoriate the radical views of Owen and Saint-Simon. In a general way he realised the need for the exercise of Christian charity, but he did not feel called upon to be a standard-bearer of the democratic movement.⁷

In addition to the reasons already given—Cardinal Wiseman's tastes, temperament and pre-occupation with other duties—there is another explanation of his detachment from social questions. The problem of poverty had not yet touched a very large proportion of his flock. The old Catholics had been of the gentry and middle class, and the new converts belonged to the middle and upper classes of English society. Only with the tide of Irish immigration was a working-class Catholic population created and a social question involving many of its own members thrust upon the Catholic Church in Great Britain.

The influx of Irish men and women was caused by the famine and fever which resulted from the failure of the potato crop in Ireland in two successive years, 1845 and 1846. The sufferers who did not die shortly after reaching the strange shores found a refuge in the slums of England's industrial towns and cities, where, unused in the main to anything but agricultural work, they went to swell the ranks of unskilled labour, and too often sank into the material and moral sordidness in which hundreds of thousands of the lower classes of Great Britain were immersed. The Irish Catholics of England gave generously of their meager earnings to increase the number of churches in the land. Their misery was a challenge to native-born Catholics to engage in social work.⁸

Cardinal Manning was the first English Catholic ecclesiastic of modern times to take up the cause of the victims of the intolerable abuses in the society around him. So important were his contri-

butions to the progress of Social Catholicism that they will be considered in two chapters of this study.

Archbishop Ullathorne, who had negotiated the restoration of the hierarchy, exerted little influence on the history of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain after that event. But he had previously won his spurs on the field of social action by the prominent part which he took in the abolition of transportation and the whole convict system. When a young man, he had volunteered for the Australian mission, and his connection with the mission, which lasted for a number of years, gave him ample opportunity to observe the horrors of the penal settlements. Called before the Select Committee which was appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into the system of transportation, he gave extensive evidence to prove that transportation had been a complete and disastrous failure both as a deterrent from crime and as a means of reformation. On account of this testimony he became an object of obloquy in those parts of the world where the inhabitants made use of the unpaid labour of convicts. But even they came to reverse their decision and to applaud him as a benefactor who had helped to remove a hideous evil from society.⁹

The decrees of the Vatican Council promulgated in 1870 caused something of a furore in England. It was then that Cardinal Newman, who had consistently followed a middle course between the ultra-infallibilists and their extreme opponents, was given an opportunity to do an invaluable service to his coreligionists. In his famous *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* he showed how groundless was the fear that a loyal Catholic could not be a loyal Englishman. Gladstone had voiced the suspicion to the contrary which lurked in the minds of a large number of his compatriots. In the twentieth century a steadily dwindling group remains—the “Gloomy Dean” of St. Paul’s is one of their number—to contest the truth of Newman’s masterly argument offered as a reply to the strictures of the great Liberal statesman.¹⁰

The Catholics of Scotland have reflected the status of their neighbours south of the Tweed. At the time of the Protestant Revolt the bulk of the Scottish people accepted the doctrines of

Calvinism. But the Catholic Church was kept alive spasmodically even in the Lowlands. Among the Celts of the Highlands, however, where lingered glorious memories of the heroes and martyrs of other days, clear vestiges of a Catholic past were to be found until such time as the fire and sword of Cumberland wiped them out after the uprising of "45." By the end of the eighteenth century Catholicism was almost dead in Scotland, and even the Presbyterian Church had fallen upon such evil days that in the beginning of the nineteenth century most of the men had ceased to attend religious services.

In 1829 there were only about seventy thousand Catholics in Scotland. The Oxford Movement, echoing through the country, added to the number, and enhanced the prestige, of Catholics. From the standpoint of numerical strength, the Church profited greatly by the Irish immigration. The increase in the city of Glasgow alone was phenomenal. Now there are over four hundred thousand Catholics in the one diocese of Glasgow, and more than two hundred thousand within the limits of the city which is the second largest in the British Isles.

Scotland participated in the industrialisation of Great Britain, and like England, had to meet the ensuing problems. Scottish Catholics have shared with their English coreligionists a zeal for the amelioration of social ills. Not long ago Lady Mackenzie, speaking before the Aberdeen Women Citizens' Association, paid a tribute to the Catholic authorities for being the first in Scotland to make provision for the care of the feeble-minded.¹¹

As regards the number of British Catholics, the difficulty of arriving at fairly accurate figures must always be taken into account. Father Herbert Thurston, in an article which appeared in the London *Month* a few years ago, after attesting the superiority of quality to quantity on the ground that one could not safely estimate the strength of a movement by the number of its ostensible adherents, proceeded with his characteristic thoroughness to dissect the available figures, and concluded that they were not reliable. It was his personal conviction, based on a careful analysis of vital statistics, that the number of residents of England

and Wales who might fairly be counted as professing Catholicism considerably exceeded 2,500,000. More than 3,000,000, he estimated, had received Catholic baptism. The current *Catholic Directory* bears out the judgment of Father Thurston by placing the total Catholic population between two and three millions. These figures are matched by noteworthy activity in the increase in the number of Catholic congregations.¹²

What are the present prospects for Catholicism in Great Britain? During the last few years a number of thoughtful observers have given opinions on this subject, some of which are interesting enough to cite. A layman in an article published in the *Hibbert Journal* for April, 1924, after tracing the ascent of Catholics from penal days, wrote in a sanguine vein of the present situation. He did not, however, share the belief of certain of his more enthusiastic coreligionists that England was likely to be converted to Catholicism. The sincere affection with which the members of non-Catholic Churches adhered to their religious convictions no less than the deeply ingrained mental characteristics and traditions of the English people would in all likelihood, he believed, prevent this consummation. A little later, as the first quarter of the twentieth century was drawing to a close, a French observer, M. Sagot, in the pages of *Le Correspondant* gave expression to sentiments even more optimistic. Comparing the situation of the Church in the United States and England with its condition in those countries one hundred years ago, he declared: "Le changement est tout simplement énorme," and added: "Sans rien exagérer, sans nous imaginer que la conversion de ces deux grands pays au catholicisme sera bientôt un fait accompli, on a le droit de considérer comme possible ce qui jadis aurait semblé irréalisable."¹³

Not all look upon the situation with eyes of optimism. Father Terence Donnelly, S. J., after a careful study of the subject, reached the conclusion that the Church in England was barely holding its own and hinted the likelihood that it might actually be losing ground. The Catholic religion in agricultural areas was making no converts and in some localities was meeting well-

defined hostility. But he who apparently regards himself as the male and modern Cassandra is Mr. Hilaire Belloc. That brilliant and versatile man of letters, whose point of view may not be uncoloured by a partially French ancestry and markedly Latin sympathies, sees yawning a dark gulf 'twixt England and the Faith. Accepting the dictum that patriotism is the religion of Englishmen, he professes to see in this fact an almost insuperable barrier to their acceptance of an international creed. That the English are any more devout worshipers at the shrines of the new religion of nationalism than are other peoples of Europe and the world would not be easy to prove. In the opinion of Mussolini's philosophical minister of education, who probably had in mind the patriotic aspirations of his chief, the phenomenon of which Mr. Belloc complains—the deification of the national state—is far more widespread than he suspects. It is more difficult to question the validity of another of his arguments. He calls attention to the profound ignorance of Catholic belief and practice to be found among Englishmen to a degree which cannot be duplicated in other nations of Europe where the Church is so closely woven into the warp and woof of the life of the people that lack of information about it or failure to appreciate its importance is seldom to be found even among its most confirmed opponents. Here indeed is a serious obstacle to the spread of Catholicism among the English people. Mr. Belloc finds some encouragement in the fact that the average intellectual Englishman is likely to suspect both Capitalism and Socialism and to favour widely distributed property. In this and in other phases of the social question the outlook of the non-Catholic in England is coming more and more to resemble that of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. Mr. Belloc, whilst recognising an improvement in the intellectual position of the Church, regards it as outweighed by the strength of the resistance which it has encountered.¹⁴

Mr. G. K. Chesterton in the preface which he wrote for the *Catholic Who's Who and Year Book for 1924* struck a different note: "—the Catholic Church, whatever else she is doing, is certainly gaining ground where she was always supposed to be

continually losing ground. She is gaining ground among the intelligent, among the speculative, we might almost say among the sceptical. The leakage which many lament is not of this kind at all. It is a pathetic but partly natural lapse of scattered and obscure people lost in the jungle of journalistic and industrial civilisation, with all its anonymity and its anarchy and its neglect of the poor." In the preface to the *Year Book for 1925* he called attention to the number of Catholics interesting themselves in all kinds of political and especially municipal activity. He rejoiced that they were not too much distracted by the "much more unreal and unrepresentative modern citizenship of the state" to exemplify the true citizenship of the city. "For it was in these civic areas, with their more direct democratic life, that there grew up those great Catholic institutions that may yet be the solution of our social misery; the Guild and the Jury and the Just Price——" ¹⁵

The Bishop of Northampton, in a Pastoral written shortly after the War, called the attention of his flock to the ubiquity of the English tongue which up to that time had been used chiefly as the vehicle for the expression of what Newman called the Protestant tradition, as the Latin of Roman civilisation was for centuries the mouthpiece of a pagan culture. But Latin, converted and baptised, became the language of the Church, continuing to spread Christianity after the decay of the Empire in the West. He hoped that the English language would one day be the channel for the diffusion of Catholic social principles, even if the British Commonwealth of Nations should go the way of other imperial aggregations and shrink to the humble size of its beginning.¹⁶

The status of organised non-Catholic religion in England is, like the present position of Catholicism, exceedingly difficult to appraise. In 1923 the Established Church, basing its conclusion on the number of Easter Communions, claimed somewhat less than two and one half million active members—but one-fourteenth of the entire nation. Ronald Knox, in an article published in *Studies* in the spring of 1926, declared that the loss of membership of non-Catholic religious bodies must not be construed as a sign

that England was turning atheist. "We English as a nation," he wrote, "are incurably sentimental. The Frenchman . . . is rather glad if he is told that there is no God. The Englishman is rather sorry if he is told that there is no God; it seems to him that another of the old landmarks is disappearing and he doesn't want it to disappear."¹⁷

The true explanation of the phenomenon, Father Knox went on to say, could be found in the fact that the average Englishman was no longer interested in dogmatic religion and the arguments which supported it. He retained, however, a belief in God and immortality, a faith which he explained on the basis of "religious experience." This sixth sense, so to speak, with the purely subjective religion to which it gave rise, was in danger of going down before the popular psychology of the present day, as the belief in Providence had been seriously weakened by the mechanistic views which prevailed in the days of Newton, and the essentials of Christianity challenged by the theory of development which grew out of the scientific interests of the nineteenth century. The writer concluded that the Catholics of England could only view with misgiving the threatened assault on the last stronghold of Protestantism. If it should be successful, Catholics would achieve an isolation and publicity not to be envied, and henceforth have to bear the brunt of all attacks upon religious faith.¹⁸

The Catholics of Great Britain are intelligent and alert and they are exerting a notable influence on the history of the intellectual class of their country. For example, their return to Oxford, first as isolated layfolk and then as members of religious orders, has been cordially welcomed by the authorities who have seen in them an important link with the university life of pre-Reformation days, and have eagerly invited expressions of the Catholic point of view in philosophy, theology and social science.¹⁹

It is the purpose of the present volume to consider the Catholics of Great Britain in connection with the various phases of the social movement. After an account of Cardinal Manning as a social reformer has been given, the influence of English Catholics on the various current economic theories will be considered and

the reasons for their unwillingness to form a Catholic political party explained. Then will follow two chapters devoted chiefly to the history of what is probably the most important and certainly the most characteristic development of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain, namely, the Catholic Social Guild. This study will close with a discussion of the broader aspects of Social Catholicism as they affect and are affected by the movement in Great Britain, and a consideration of the part which English Catholics are playing in the striving for world peace.

The dawn of 1927 brought a message of good will from the President of the Catholic Social Guild, Archbishop Keating of Liverpool. Among other things he wrote:—

"The Catholic Social Guild . . . brings together for the study of social problems, all the elements of our complex society, men and women, priests and layfolk, lettered and unlettered, employers and employed. Within the compass of its study-circles, it gives the lie to the mischievous generalisation that all 'coal-owners' are blood-suckers, and all 'coal-getters' are bolshevists; and clears away the mists of party feeling, which obscure the saving truth that the bulk of employers and the bulk of the employed, not only have common interests in their industry, but also abundance of mutual respect and good-will, when left free to indulge it. The typical 'capitalist,' and the typical 'communist,' like the typical 'jesuit,' are mere freaks of over-heated imagination. There are good men and bad men; but they belong to all classes alike; and even the worst have one redeeming feature at least—humanity." ²⁰

It is in this spirit that the Social Catholics of Great Britain carry on their work.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Pollard, A. F., *The History of England* (New York and London, 1912), Ch. iv.; Cheyney, E. P., *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England* (New York, 1921), Ch. ii-vi; Gasquet, F. A., *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (London, 1906), Ch. xix; Gairdner, *The English Church* (London and New York, 1902), Ch. xi; Cunningham, W., *Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times* (Cambridge, 1912), Part I, Introduction; Slater, G., *The Making of Modern England*

(Boston and New York, etc., 1915), Ch. ii and iii. The Catholic Truth Society of England has republished portions of Cobbett's *History of the Reformation* (1824-27), in two pamphlets, entitled respectively *The Suppression of the English Monasteries* and *Social Effects of the Reformation*.

² Hayes, C. J. H., *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe* (New York, 1918), Vol. ii, pp. 65-99; *Cambridge Modern History* (New York, 1911), Vol. x, Ch. xxiii.

³ Newman, J. H., *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England Addressed to the Brothers of the Oratory in the Summer of 1851* (London, etc., 1903); *Dublin Review*, Vol. 128 (1901), pp. 228-255; *Revue Générale*, Vol. 73 (1901), p. 902, *et seq.*; Jarrett, B., *Social Theories of the Middle Ages* (London, 1926), Ch. v and vi.

⁴ Cardinal Wiseman's *Pastoral* (London, 1850), p. 5.

⁵ *Catholic Mind*, Vol. 20 (1922), pp. 294-299; *Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1912), Vol. 15, pp. 670-674; Ward, W., *Ten Personal Studies* (London, 1908), pp. 213, 214; *Dublin Review*, *op. cit.*, p. 235; See *The Roman Catholic Question* (London, 1850?), for the Apostolic Letter of Pope Pius IX, Cardinal Wiseman's *Pastoral*, etc., as well as for some of the discussion to which they gave rise.

⁶ Wiseman, *An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy* (London, 1850), pp. 30, 31.

⁷ Wiseman, *The Social and Intellectual State of England Compared with Its Moral Condition*; *Idem*, *A Sermon Delivered in St. George's Catholic Church—Southwork, Sunday, Aug. 11, 1850*; *Idem*, *Sermon Preached at the Jesuits' Church on the 4th of May, 1851, on Behalf of the Convent of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd*, pp. 6-7; *Idem*, *Essays on Various Subjects*, Vol. iii, p. 229; Ward, W., *op. cit.*, p. 214. *Idem*, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (London, 1897).

⁸ Ward, B., *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation* (London, 1915), Vol. ii, pp. 130-145; *New Age*, June 5, 1913—Oct. 2, 1913.

⁹ Butler, C., *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne* 2 vols. (New York, 1926), Vol. i, pp. 90-116; *The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne* (London, 1892?), pp. 53-176; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 15, pp. 121-2. Ullathorne had also helped to lessen the amount of intemperance in Australia by the repeated preaching of a sermon on "The Drunkard"—a terrible indictment which, often reprinted, has done valiant service in England and Ireland as well as in the Island continent. Butler, C., *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 87-89; Ullathorne, W. B. *The Drunkard* (London), C. T. S. Pamphlet.

¹⁰ Thureau-Dangin, *English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century* 2 vols. (London, 1914), Vol. ii, Ch. vii; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 5, p. 456.

¹¹ *Revue Générale*, *op. cit.*, pp. 918-919; *The Catholic News* (New York City), Sept. 9, 1922, and Sept. 13, 1924; *Universe*, May 23, 1913; *Commonweal*, Dec. 22, 1926; *Ibid.*, Apr. 20, 1927.

¹² *Month*, Vol. 138 (1921), pp. 542-545. This discussion is based on figures for marriages and baptisms. *Ibid.*, Vol. 143 (1924), pp. 237-47; *America*, April 3, 1926; *Catholic News*, Dec. 27, 1924, Jan. 9 and Feb. 6, 1926; *Catholic Directory*, 1926 (London, etc.), p. 623 A. According to

the *Catholic Directory*, the number of Catholics in the entire British Empire is 15,256,399. *Ibid.*, p. 623 D; *Universe*, Dec. 31, 1926.

¹² *Le Correspondant*, Je. 10, 1925.

¹⁴ *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 131 (1923), pp. 309-315; *Catholic World*, Vol. 118 (1924), pp. 681-683; *Columbia*, Vol. 5 (1926), pp. 5-6, 45-47.

¹⁵ *Catholic Who's Who and Year Book*, 1924, Preface, p. xii; *idem*, 1925, Preface, p. xiv.

¹⁶ *Tablet*, Jan. 11, 1919. The Bishop mentioned the Catholic Truth Society as having already gained such a hearing for the Catholic point of view. In England itself one unique way of bringing the teachings of Catholicism to the masses of the English people is through the lectures given by the members of the Catholic Evidence Guild, especially in Hyde Park and on the street corners of London. Byrne, J., *Handbook of the Catholic Evidence Guild* (London, 1922); *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 8 (1924), pp. 132-134; *Commonweal*, April 28, 1926.

¹⁷ *Studies*, Vol. 15 (1926), p. 21.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

On December 15, 1926, the Catholic Relief Bill received the Royal Assent. This measure wiped out nearly all of the remaining disabilities which had been a source of embarrassment or financial loss to the Catholics of Great Britain. Under the previous state of the law, for example, Catholic charities, or charities managed by Catholics, were unable to obtain exemption from the income tax; and bequests to certain Catholic societies, especially monastic establishments, were legally void. *Times*, June 23, 1926; *Tablet*, June 26, 1926; *Catholic News*, Dec. 11, 1926; *Month*, Vol. 149 (1927), p. 72.

¹⁹ *America*, May 25, 1918; Martindale, C. C., *Catholics in Oxford* (Oxford, 1925)—an historical sketch of Catholics in Oxford from 1581 to 1925.

²⁰ *Christian Democrat*, Vol. 7 (1927), pp. 1-2.

CHAPTER I

CARDINAL MANNING AS A SOCIAL REFORMER

BACKGROUND

"My . . . birth, training, and relations in life would have carried me into the Primrose League."¹ Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, wrote these words in 1890 toward the end of a life spent in activities which would have horrified members of that conservative society. In spite of heredity, and the environment of childhood, Henry Edward Manning did not choose, as did some ancient Athenian nobles, to be "hostile to the Demos." Instead, according to the testimony of a journal by no means friendly to the religious cause which he served, he "wielded more influence in turning the genius of the Roman Catholic Church into what we may call democratic channels than any other Englishman of his day," and possessed "more influence than Newman on the practical policy of the Church and over her relations with . . . great social movements."²

He stood indeed with Newman as one of the two most conspicuous representatives of Catholicism in the England of the nineteenth century. Entirely unlike in temperament and in the nature of their intellectual gifts—the one a scholarly recluse, the other a man of action—these two converts from Anglicanism played distinguished rôles in the religious life of their day and nation.³ It is natural to inquire into the extent and nature of the influence which each exerted on the development of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain. Newman may be dismissed with a word. Neither inclination nor the exigencies of his position compelled him to take part in the public life of his time, though, had he been so inclined, his duties as parish priest in the

great commercial center where he lived for a time would have drawn him into it. Small groups of friends felt the subtle influence of his attractive personality, whilst he shrank from entering the arena of public affairs. He used his rare gifts of logic and style to elucidate subjects of religious and philosophical interest and he was by no means insensible to the historic principle of evolution as it affected the domain of intellect—witness, for example, his famous *Essay on the Development of Doctrine*. But as far as any effect which it might have had on his own life and work was concerned, the Industrial Revolution, with the radical changes which it brought about in the material life of man and indirectly in his intellectual outlook and spiritual condition, need not have taken place. In this respect, Newman bore some resemblance to his distinguished contemporary in political life, William Ewart Gladstone.⁴

With Manning it was otherwise. His childhood, to be sure, was spent in an England which had not yet felt the effects of the transformation wrought in all departments of life by the rapid multiplication of mechanical inventions. His maturity, however, saw the vast changes introduced by the factory system. Keen of perception and broad of vision, he was not oblivious to the evil fruits of this stupendous innovation, fruits which flourished in the atmosphere of Economic Liberalism, which misguided philosophy had at the same time choked the good fruits, excepting those purely financial ones which were reaped by a small minority of the English people. Singularly equipped with a zeal for human welfare and with a capacity to grapple successfully with all questions of actuality, he threw himself generously into the work of social reform and was eager to see his coreligionists follow his example in facing the problems of the day and taking a worthy part in their solution.

So prominent a rôle did Manning play in the religious history of the nineteenth century that it would be scarcely just to plunge into a consideration of his career as a social reformer without reference, however slight, to some other aspects of his life. He was born at Totteridge in Hertfordshire. His father was William Man-

ning, Governor of the Bank of England, whose high social position and subsequent business failure the younger Manning was able to recall. The boy was educated at Harrow and Oxford. But his own course of life owed little directly to the Oxford Movement. "I became a Catholic off my own bat,"⁵ he wrote later, drawing his metaphor from the cricket field of Harrow. Meanwhile as an Anglican clergyman he worked first as rector of Lavington and later was appointed archdeacon of Chichester. In 1851 he became a convert to Catholicism. His rise in the Church was exceedingly rapid and he became successively priest, provost of Westminster, Archbishop of Westminster in 1865, and, ten years later, Cardinal. It has been said that the Chair of Peter itself might have been his had he so desired. He died in January, 1892, at the age of eighty-three.⁶

Neither his tireless zeal as a shepherd of souls, his policies as an ecclesiastical statesman, nor even his reactions to the religious and intellectual questions of the day fall directly within the scope of this work. But some allusion to them is not out of place, because they cannot fail to add interest to his personality and put his life into a truer historical perspective. At the Vatican Council in 1870, he stood in the very focus of the attention of the world while with untiring insistence he electioneered for—and can his activities be expressed in more appropriate words?—the promulgation of the decree of papal infallibility with an intransigent zeal that rivaled the enthusiasm for the papacy felt by Mr. William George Ward, and threw into striking contrast the equally indefatigable anti-ultramontanism of the distinguished historian, Lord Acton.⁷

The Vatican Decrees went forth, and subsequent events have justified neither the hopes nor the fears of the extremists. Statesmen like Bismarck saw a clash of principles; and back in England, four years late, Gladstone, worried over the political possibilities of an infallible pope, made a belated attack upon the papal prerogative which strained to the breaking point the already weakening friendship between him and Manning.

Archbishop Manning had been not only "*Il diavolo del con-*

cilio"⁸ in which the decree of infallibility was declared, but a staunch upholder of the temporal power at the time when that succumbed to the force of Italian nationalism. While never abandoning the principle of the territorial independence of the Holy See, Manning came in later years to see the practical advantage of a rapprochement between the Vatican and the Quirinal, in which realisation he was somewhat ahead of his times. Other ideas of his are likewise not without their interest in the light of later events. He strongly urged the disestablishment of the Church in France, as a measure calculated to leave the clergy there poor but immeasurably nearer the people whom they served. Advocating, as he did in the latter part of his life, friendship between England and Ireland on the basis of self-government for the Irish people within the Empire, he would have welcomed the setting up of the Irish Free State as one of the community of English-speaking peoples amongst whom he was so anxious that amity should abide.⁹

Such in brief was his world view. In his own diocese he was showing his prejudices as well as pursuing his policies. Among the former may be mentioned an antipathy to the Jesuits, born of the belief that they had not been innocent of a share in the religious débâcle of the sixteenth century, and of his fear that they were usurping the prestige which he felt should belong to his beloved secular clergy. His dislike of theatrical performances, both public and private, was puritanical in its intensity. As an example of the breadth of his contacts may be cited his participation in the discussions of the Metaphysical Society where on one occasion Ruskin read a paper on miracles, and on another Huxley read one on "Has a frog a soul, and, if so, of what nature?" Manning gravely responded to the latter with a discussion of the relation of the will to thought.¹⁰

What made this man a social reformer? Why "after battles of dogma at the court of Rome" did he spend "his last forces fighting in the open for the poor of London to rescue them from their own temptations and the oppression of their masters?"¹¹ The average reader is better acquainted with the brilliant portrait of Manning

drawn by the skilled hand of Mr. Lytton Strachey than with the Manning of history. Through the story which this literary artist tells of the career of the great Cardinal there runs the ever-recurring theme of his ambition, forcing itself on the attention like the *Leitmotiv* of a Wagnerian opera.¹² Even in affairs not concerned with his social action this estimate remains one-sided and unjust, as is shown by his unwillingness to be considered as a successor to Pope Pius IX.¹³ How much less did the motive of ambition explain his interest in social reforms! On this point the comment of Mr. Lunn, a writer unfriendly to the Catholic Church, is worth recording: "Manning's contempt for public opinion in his ultramontane battles should absolve him from the charge of mere popularity hunting in his fight for the poor."¹⁴ Ambition and self-seeking were not at the root of his activity as a social reformer. How then to explain it? To say its source was to be found entirely in the Gospels would not be to carry it back as far as Manning himself would have wished it traced. In answer to the question posited in 1890, "Why are my politics popular even to Radicalism?" he wrote ". . . I made a study of the New Testament in English and in Greek. Gradually the people widened out before me. Then the theocracy of the Old Testament brought before me God and the people as the commonwealth of man." Moses, he was wont to say in jest, had made him a Radical.¹⁵

It was, however, not only the democratic strength of Sinai but to a greater degree the tender compassion of Galilee which shone resplendent in the life and work of the English cardinal. It was the charity of Christ which bore him toward the people.¹⁶ To have thought and acted other than he did would have been incompatible in his eyes with the Christianity which he professed. He had a deep compassion on the multitude, for they had nothing to eat. "For more than fifty years I have lived among the people, seventeen among ploughmen and shepherds in Sussex, and nine and thirty among the people of London. I have seen and heard and known their wants, sufferings, hardships, and the defeat of their petitions and hopes, and my whole soul is with them. . . . Such

is my Radicalism going down to the roots of the sufferings of the people." ¹⁷

A story is told that Cardinal Manning and two of his priests were once asked what each would be if he were not a priest. One said, "A doctor" and the other "A temperance advocate." "And I," said the Cardinal, "Radical member for Marylebone." Marylebone was at that time politically the rowdiest of constituencies. ¹⁸

Manning's type of character, moreover, predisposed him to his work in behalf of those who laboured and were heavily burdened. Religion, even so universal a faith as Catholicism, is coloured by the temperament of a believer, as by the ideology of a people. It is not, for instance, by accident that contemplative saints do not flourish in the United States of America and that the most distinctive feature of American Catholicism is its generosity. In each case is reflected a limitation and a virtue of the American genius. A Catholic who is likewise an American citizen is less likely to succumb to the passive weakness of excessive mysticism than to the active self-confidence of Pelagianism. It was, therefore, to be expected that Manning, by nature a man of action and a strong-willed fighter for causes which struck him as just, should, since love for the poor was a vital part of his religion, take up the activities of a social reformer. In good works of a very practical character we see the manifestation of his lively faith.

There was yet another motive for his humanitarian services. He was anxious to enhance the prestige of Catholicism in the eyes of Englishmen; and, believing that the future belonged to the masses, he was eager to align the Church with the forces of triumphant democracy.

As regards England, he was in many respects not agreeable to the old English Catholics, and he in turn abhorred their shrinking exclusiveness, tintured as it was with Erastianism. He thought that by interesting them in social service he could bring them out of their isolation into coöperation with their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. "I do not believe that the English people will be won back through the intellect. . . . They may be won by human love, care and brotherhood drawing the human will to the Divine

presence. . . . The charities of London are manifold . . . and any man holding the office [of Bishop] ought to sympathise with all." ¹⁹

Even before his conversion to the Catholic Church he sensed the trend of the times: "The course of Europe," he wrote in 1839, "seems to be towards a development of national life and action by calling up into a political power larger numbers of the people. The middle classes are such already—they are an oligarchy, an intelligent, energetic, self-respecting class, but selfish and subjective. Now the Catholic system is self-abolishing and objective." ²⁰ Again, "The politicians and political economists of the modern school have had their day, and the twentieth century will be altogether for the people, and for the laws of common prosperity under a Christian régime." ²¹ "The coming century," he prophesied in a letter to the Count de Mun in January, 1891, "will belong not to the capitalist nor to the middle classes, but to the people." ²² He was anxious that his coreligionists should keep in touch with the affairs of the day: "Catholics cannot meet without being forced into the time-spirit. We do not live in an exhausted receiver. The middle ages are passed. There is no zone of calms for us. We are in the modern world—in the trade winds of the nineteenth century—and we must brace ourselves to lay hold of the world as it grapples with us, and to meet it intellect to intellect, culture to culture, science to science." ²³

This idea, translated into terms of social reform, meant that Catholics should keep *au courant* with economic and sociological problems, and, by aiding in their solution, perform a task incumbent on them as Christians and beneficial to their status in the modern world.

Before an account is given of Manning's actual work in the field of social reform some space must be devoted to his theories on the subject as set forth in his speeches and writings. Lemire, it is true, is inclined to regard the theories as born of the acts, for after his discussion of the League of the Cross he has these words:

"Là fut le point de départ de sa popularité. Avant de faire des théories sociales, il pratiqua les oeuvres, comme son divin Maître,

qui n'instruisait, qu'après avoir donné le exemple: coepit facere et docere." ²⁴ Actions, it is true, might have produced the ideas, and psychologists like the late William James and Antonin Eymieu would not be adverse to such an interpretation. But it seems permissible to follow the equally tenable theory that vivid ideas tend to realise themselves and proceed to set forth the views of Manning on the social question.

There is nothing startling about them. To use the word carefully—as it seldom is used—Manning was not a "radical." He defended private property as a right while denouncing abuses in its exercise. He did not, however, regard the prevailing relationship between employer and employee, so unjust to the latter, as deeply rooted in the essence of things. Economic Liberalism was not in his eyes a part of the cosmic order. In this respect he was ahead of his time and even more advanced in outlook than those of our contemporaries who question the right of collective bargaining and seriously contest the justice of a living wage. Not only was he not revolutionary, but he was not profound. He founded no school of economic thought; he gave his name to no new economic theory. But these considerations detract in no way from the power of his message or the far-reaching consequences of his acts. A doctrinaire political economist would, in all probability, have given less sympathy and certainly less time to the practical alleviation of human woes. Manning simply applied the principles of Christian charity and of Christian justice to the solution of vexing social and economic problems. And the significance of this fact cannot be grasped because such an application has never been made on a scale sufficiently grand to give us material for deduction.

The pity of it is that such a man as Manning was not always greeted as a prophet by those who should have been his friends but became even an object of dislike as he preached his Social Catholicism, which has been called "the most hateful of new doctrines to those faithful who look upon the Church as the guardian of their interests, and upon religion as the best safeguard of property." ²⁵ Disquieted by what might be expected of them

if they took to heart the views that he expounded, such as these went their way in sorrow—for they had great possessions.

“My politics are social politics.” Manning had no direct party affiliations and was contemptuous of the “Talking Mill at Westminster.”²⁶ On more than one occasion he emphasized his detachment from political machinery. As early as 1866 he said, “I have no party politics, but would oppose both parties or support either when they act justly to the Holy See and to our poor.”²⁷ And again, “I have endeavoured to keep myself absolutely independent of all political parties. Lord Salisbury acknowledged this in describing the politics of the Royal Commissioners. When he came to me, he said, ‘As to Cardinal Manning, no one can say of what Party he is.’”²⁸ Yet his sympathies were on the whole with the Liberals, and he objected in no uncertain terms to the Tory sympathies of many of the English Catholics.²⁹

Whilst holding aloof from political parties as such, he advocated social legislation, and applied his moral measuring rod to all bills which concerned in any way the economic life of the people. To be sure, he did not, like Devas and De Pascal, regard political economy as a branch of ethics. But he was equally opposed to the views of men like Mill and Ricardo who held it to be divorced from ethics. To him, political economy was a moral science, distinct from ethics but subject to its laws.³⁰

As a result of the teachings of the Manchester School, labour had been unjustly relegated to second place in its relations with capital and had been deprived of the legal protection which was its due. The aim of society had become the production of riches instead of the diffusion of human happiness, and man, the sole economic unit, had been neglected in his needs and in his rights. No wonder, then, that the repudiation of *laissez-faire* is written large across the pages which explain to us the social and economic theories of Henry Edward Manning.³¹

THEORIES ON THE SOCIAL QUESTION

Manning’s views on the labour problem were first set forth at length in an address delivered on January 28, 1874, before

the members of the Leeds Mechanics' Institute. This was the keynote speech of his campaign by word and act for the betterment of the condition of the working class. Its subject was "The Dignity and Rights of Labour."³²

Labour, he said, rather than capital, or even skill, was the cause of wealth and the origin of all England's greatness, and he defined it as "the honest exertion of the powers of mind and body for our own good and the good of our neighbour." "Any man," he declared, "who fulfills the lot of his existence is in a state of dignity." Labour, he went on to say, is not only "the law of our state, it is also the law of our development—it is the law of the development of mind and body . . . the condition of all invention . . . [and] with invention . . . the condition of all creation."³³

For the second part of his thesis he took the rights of labour, claiming for it at the outset the rights of property. "It is," he declared, "capital in the truest sense"—live money as distinct from the dead capital which was dependent on it and with which it must be united.

As might be expected, Manning's contention, later reiterated, that labour and skill be recognised as capital was not to pass unchallenged. Mr. Boulton, for example, in a letter to Manning on January 24, 1890, refused to accept as a matter of definition that labour and skill were capital. "To my mind," he wrote, "skill, labour and capital are three very distinct entities, each having a right to, and in fact commanding, its own separate hire and reward."³⁴

In view of the widespread use of the word "proletariat" at the present day, it is not uninteresting to learn what Manning thought of such terminology. "I had ten thousand times rather be called a working man than a prolétaire. I will tell you my reasons against the name of prolétaire. It is pedantry; and it is an indignity to the working man . . . dug up out of old Roman law by certain French writers, chiefly in or about the time of the first French Revolution."³⁵

Labour, he declared, was entitled not only to the rights of property but to the rights of liberty. The labourer had the right

to determine for whom he should work and upon what wages he could live. Should he abuse either right he must pay the penalty.³⁶

Moreover, labour had a right not only to its own freedom, but it had a right to protect itself. Manning recalled to his hearers the fact that in the earliest period of Saxon history there were to be found associations distinct from the life of the family on the one hand and from the State on the other. In the order of commerce there must be a field regulated by laws of its own. He said he could conceive of nothing more entirely in accordance with natural rights and with the higher jurisprudence than that those who had one common interest should unite for the promotion of that interest. He cited the rise of guilds. These, of course, had their religious side and they were benefit societies; but they were also for protection and for the vindication of liberty from the oppressive jurisdiction of those who held local authority. The craft guilds were composed of masters and of men, of employers and of employed, those who possessed respectively the dead and the live capital of labour.³⁷

To Manning the right of association was incontestable. He always recommended it in all its forms. It might be local and permanent, as in townships; accidental and ephemeral, in the case of meetings and reunions for discussion of or action upon matters of passing interest; or limited and restricted, a type of association apparent in unions of workers. But of association, whether political or industrial in its purpose, he was a staunch advocate. Like Taine, he opposed the administrative centralisation of France; and saw in its deficiency in local political associations an element weakening the principle of trade unionism. To the isolation of workers everywhere, he set up as an alternative the value of association, either in temporary coalitions for strikes or permanently in unions. He did not hesitate to recognise in principle the legitimacy of the strike, as frequently the only weapon in the hands of the workers strong enough to rebuke the despotism of capital.³⁸

Association failing, it was necessary to have recourse to the civil authorities. He advocated in such instances the intervention of the State. Quoting with approval from Pitt's speech on the

Arbitration Act, he concurred in the statement that Parliament was omnipotent to protect.³⁹

When the State intervenes it ought to be on the side of the weaker, for there is no equality of struggle between the worker and his employer: "The living capital must eat; the dead capital can sleep." Under the system of free contract the employers are the masters. Work is not a commodity, a value regulated by economic laws, but a human and social act, entailing moral consequences for the individual workman and the family.⁴⁰

Manning pleaded for a shorter work day, affirming that the application of unchecked political economy to the hours of labour must be met and limited by a moral condition: "If the great end of life were to multiply yards of cloth and cotton twist, and if the glory of England consists or consisted in multiplying without stint or limit these articles and the like at the lowest possible price so as to undersell all the nations of the world, well, then, let us go on. But if the domestic life of the people be vital above all; if the peace, the purity of homes, the education of children, the duties of wives and mothers, the duties of husbands and of fathers, be written in the natural law of mankind, and if these things are sacred, far beyond anything that can be sold in the market, then I say, if the hours of labour resulting from the unregulated sale of a man's strength and skill shall lead to the destruction of domestic life, to the neglect of children, to turning wives and mothers into living machines, and of fathers and husbands into—what shall I say, creatures of burden?—I will not use any other word—who rise before the sun, and come back when it is set, wearied and able only to take food and lie down to rest; the domestic life of men exists no longer, and we dare not go on in this path."⁴¹ Parliament, at the instance of Lord Shaftesbury, had set a precedent for such interference by the regulation of child labour.⁴² Manning regarded the industrial employment of women as a grave detriment to the domestic life of the nation. He did not understand, he said, how a woman could train her children in the hours after school if she worked all day in a factory.⁴³

More than a decade after he first set forth in principle the jus-

tice of state interference, he gave it the following specific application at a meeting of the Shop Hours League and Trades Parliamentary Association, held in St. James's Hall in May, 1886:

"I am rejoiced that there is a prospect of a legal enactment enabling the local authorities to close all shops at an earlier hour on one day in the week. Where a general coercive law is impossible, power given to a locality to put an Act of Parliament into force will operate as an example to the whole country. I first interested myself in this movement for the shortening of hours in the case of shepherds and ploughmen; and I am now continuing it amongst the overworked of London; having no desire nearer to my heart than to see your lot, which is heavy indeed, lightened and brightened by any effort that can be made." ⁴⁴

The interventionism of Manning in so far as it called for the protection of women and children and the restriction of night and of Sunday work was to meet with few serious objections. But his extension of the principle to include the limitation of the hours of labour and the establishment of a minimum wage gave rise to brisk controversy. After the death of the Bishop of Liège there waged a veritable battle between the partisans and the opponents of the Cardinal on the subject of a living wage. Count de Mun, Père Pascal and some prominent industrialists like M. Harmel gave their support to Manning. In Germany, Mgr. Korum and Canon Winterer; in Austria, von Vogelsang; in Switzerland, Decurtins; with their followers, also took his part. And the teaching of Pope Leo XIII in his famous Encyclical on the Condition of the Working Classes, was favourable to the thesis of Manning—that wages should not be insufficient to permit a worker and his family to live in honesty and in health.⁴⁵

To return for a last word to the lecture in which Manning first expounded these views. He touched in closing on the wretchedness of the London poor and deplored the miserable housing conditions of which they were the victims. Summarising his remarks, he said, "I have endeavoured to draw out before you what is the dignity of labour. It is the law of our state, the law of our development and perfection, the source of invention, the power of

creation and the cause of manifold capital in money and in skill. And as to its rights, I have shown that it is true property, true capital, that it has a primary right to freedom, a right to protect itself and a claim upon the law of the land to protect it.”⁴⁶

In 1880 in a Lenten Pastoral, Manning contrasted the immeasurable wealth of England which had been created by the unprecedented commercial activity and prosperity of its people with the almost incredible want existing by its side. “We have in the midst of us, not poverty alone, which is an honourable state when it is honest and inevitable, but also pauperism which is the corruption of poverty and the debasement of the poor. The inequalities of our social state, and the chasms which separate classes, the abrupt and harsh contrasts of soft and suffering lots, unless they be redressed by humility and charity, sympathy and self-denial, are dangerous to society and to our spiritual welfare. In London all these inequalities and evils are before us.”⁴⁷

In the pages of the *Dublin Review*, in 1885 Manning advocated a change in the land laws of England. He called attention to the incredibly small number of landlords who possessed the land of England—only a twentieth part of the population, he estimated, when those who had small holdings were included,—and he said that the possession of land was the firm ascending scale of social growth. The “have-nots” and the “lack lands,” he warned, were the hands and feet of revolution which put all things down.⁴⁸

In the fall of 1887 he turned his attention to the coöperative movement when he received a deputation from the London Coöperative Clothing Manufacturing Co., and association of English, Scottish and Irish artisans. He expressed his willingness to assist in any way he could, desiring, however, to hear first the opinion of Lord Ripon who was thoroughly acquainted with the coöperative movement. The Cardinal based his approval of the proposal on his belief that it would profit the workers materially and morally and lead to the production of honest work. “Mr. Herbert Spencer has written strongly on the positive insincerity and dishonesty which now characterises British manufacturers, and is destroying the British character. That is a painful fact; for formerly the

English name was a sufficient guarantee of good work all over the world.”⁴⁹

During the unemployment crisis of 1888, Cardinal Manning denounced as “heartless and headless” a proposition in the *Times* of February first that the only way to make more work for the unemployed was for the employed to produce as much profit as they could over the cost of producing; for all that profit must be spent on employing somebody in some way or other. This proposition signed “G” and generally understood to be from the pen of the eminent economist and statistician, Mr. Robert Giffen, was answered in three long letters to the *Times*. Perhaps there would be no surplus, declared Manning, or those making it would be unwilling to expend it in employing labour, or perhaps they might do so at a place distant from that where the surplus had been made—in which case the working population would be forced to “lead a nomad life, going to and fro, and hunting after the surplus they had made.” Such arguments as this had destroyed the two propositions of raising a fund and of giving work. The present Poor Law, he went on to say, did not meet the crisis. That of Elizabeth which had made provision for temporary as well as chronic poverty was superior. In addition, he gave it as his opinion that the harsh and niggardly method of administering the Poor Law had been largely responsible for the making of criminals.⁵⁰

Manning’s statement, made at this time, that “every man has a right to work or to bread” was widely denounced as a socially dangerous principle. He defended himself in the pages of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*. “I have,” he concluded, “committed *lèse majesté* by rudely reminding some who rule over public opinion in London of the fresh mother earth, and of the primeval laws that protect her offspring. I was unconscious of my audacity. I thought I was uttering truisms which all educated men knew and believed. But I found that these primary truths of human life were forgotten, and that on this forgetfulness a theory and a treatment of our poor had formed a system of thought and action which hardens the hearts of the rich and grinds the faces of the poor. I am glad, therefore, that I said and

wrote what is before the public, even though for a time some men have called me a socialist and a revolutionist, and have fastened upon a subordinate consequence, and neglected the substance of my contention in behalf of the natural rights of the poor." ⁵¹

On the important question of English trade, Manning, during that same anxious period, made a thoughtful comment when questioned by the Hon. Percy Wyndham as to whether he did not think a solution of the problem might be found in "Fair Trade." The Cardinal was convinced that England had passed the highest point of its prosperity, a prosperity apparently the result of such transient causes as the invention and application of machinery to production and of steam to the invention of machinery, in which England had the start of all nations. "This," he wrote, "is all reversed and can never return. . . . The *Times* of yesterday shows that all nations are rising relatively to England, and notably Germany." As to the depressed condition of the labour market, he said he saw no remedy and predicted that unless the colonists saved England the capitalists would be the next to suffer. "I have believed in Free Trade all my life. . . . It prospered when all its conditions were in our favour; but this does not prove that it will prosper when they are, if not altogether, at least extensively changed." ⁵²

Through the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* in an article on "Distress in London: A Note on Outdoor Relief," Cardinal Manning again replied to the article and a letter published in the *Times* to the effect that he had given countenance to the fallacy that under the Poor Law men had a natural right to work or to bread; and that his words implied "a censure upon the whole administration of the Poor Law, and would countenance the giving of relief to men in their own homes." Manning pleaded guilty to both impleachments. The Elizabethan Poor Law, he showed, made provision not only for supplying bread to the starving or the impecunious but also assumed that work should be provided for the unemployed. Whether by giving bread or work, all men, asserted Manning, were bound by natural obligations to feed the hungry. This obligation sprang from the natural right of every man to life,

a right so strict that it took precedence over all positive laws of property. ". . . a starving man," he declared, "has a natural right to his neighbour's bread. . . . The law of natural charity recognises in each the same right to live and imposes upon us all according to our power the obligation to sustain the life of others as we sustain our own."

To prove that the right to work was legally recognised in the Poor Laws, the Cardinal quoted from the 43 Eliz. c.2, a statute which was the foundation of the existing Poor Law. One of the four purposes of the compulsory assessment was to provide a stock of wool, hemp, flax, iron and other ware or stuff on which the poor should be set to work.

Manning was pleased to recall that the Poor Laws also aimed to promote domestic life. With reference to the provision of the same Act extending mutual liability of maintenance to grandfathers and grandmothers, he wrote, "I fail to recognise in these statutes an administration of the law by which the old and the helpless are removed from their children and their kindred into a workhouse as a condition of relief, still less the refusal of outdoor relief. . . . Stone-breaking and crank-turning are well enough as a deterrent for loafers and criminals but the workhouse is a cruel deterrent when offered to families, who, by a wise assistance in time of need, may be carried through the straits of winter when in want of work." He believed that the administration of the Poor Law in his day as compared with the old statutes implied a decline of Christianity "and an application of political economy uncontrolled by the moral laws of human sympathy and of the compassion which wealth owes to poverty."⁵³

Purcell regarded the discussions and correspondence between Manning and Mr. S. B. Boulton, of Copped Hall, Totteridge, Chairman of the London Board of Conciliation, as the most authoritative exposition of the Cardinal's views on social and economic questions during the last three years of his life.

Mr. Boulton tells how, on the occasion of a visit from Manning, he touched on the incalculable benefits derived from the latter's intervention in the recent Dockers' Strike; but suggested that,

however valuable the mediation had been under those exceptional circumstances, arbitration by one eminent person, however disinterested and benevolent, was not the method which should be normally applied to the settlement of labour disputes. He mentioned the intervention of representatives of labour and capital as conciliators and arbitrators in cases where employers and workmen had failed to arrive at a mutual agreement; and appealed to the Cardinal to support the effort then being made at the London Chamber of Commerce to provide a Labour Conciliation Board.

The Cardinal declared that if such an organisation could be established on fair and equitable bases, he would be prepared to use his influence in its favour. This promise he kept. He consented to join a Committee of Enquiry nominated by the London Chamber of Commerce with instructions to report on the practicality of establishing a Conciliation Board for the London District of which Mr. Boulton was chairman. Although ill health kept the aged Cardinal from attending any of the meetings, he keenly followed the development of the scheme, and by correspondence and personal interviews gave information and exercised influence in its behalf. He approved the plan by which the Conciliation Board was finally set up; and it was he, acting with Mr. Sydney Buxton, who submitted one of the first labour disputes to it for settlement.⁵⁴

Cardinal Manning believed in the necessity for international action in behalf of democracy and of the working classes. He advocated world peace, or at least disarmament, and looked to the Pope to take the initiative. Though a friend of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, he found in the rupture between the papacy and Italy a gleam of hope for the future, in so far as in freeing itself from tendencies exclusively Italian, the papacy was turned in the direction of a religious revolution which was rapidly approaching. The axis of the Catholic world was changing and the Saxon race was replacing the Latins.⁵⁵

Lemire cites, in verification of Manning's ideas, that already the isolation of the Pope had permitted him to treat with an absolute independence and disinterestedness beyond all suspicion the great

international question of the condition of the workers. Manning saw a mutual advantage in an alliance between the papacy and the poor. The bourgeoisie had brought about the separation of Church and State with the consequent suppression of the temporal power of the Pope. The democracy would effect a reconciliation between the Church and society, and, as a crowning to the great work, restore the territorial independence of the Pope under a form and by methods not yet foreseen. In this way the intervention of the Church, demanding that the governments concern themselves with economic questions, would find its recompense. On the day of his jubilee he rejoiced as he contemplated the vigorous young churches of Ireland, England, America and Australia, celebrating, as it were, in a unanimous concert the union of Catholicism and democracy.⁵⁶

Manning looked with favour on the progress of social reform in France. He admired the *patronage* there, but regarded it as impracticable for England; he eulogised the good fruits of the charity made popular by St. Vincent de Paul. As we have seen, he opposed the centralisation of France as inimical to liberty of association, and advocated the disestablishment of the Church. Authority had passed from the hands of the classes into those of the masses. These the Church must meet and save. "L'avenir est à la démocratie. C'est elle qu'il faut sauver, qu'il faut rendre chrétienne. C'est d'elle qu'il faut se rapprocher," he remarked in an interview with Abbé Lemire.⁵⁷

Needless to say, Manning enthusiastically favoured the international conference of Berlin called in March, 1890, by the German Emperor for the consideration of social problems. In a letter which he wrote to the editor of the *Deutsche Revue*, he characterised this invitation as "the worthiest that has proceeded from any sovereign of our times," and made brief but trenchant allusion to the unhappy lot of the wage-earning people of every European country.⁵⁸

The Conference took favourable action on such matters as Sunday rest, the protection of women and children and the safeguarding of the health of mine workers. Manning approved of

these measures and once cited them as the irreducible minimum for the workers of the world.⁵⁹

The Cardinal, as one of the vice-presidents of the League for Peace, pronounced an important discourse at its fifth annual Congress in June, 1888. After praising it for its purpose of promoting the principle of arbitration and of peace, he called the attention of the assemblage to the fact that the destinies of Europe were at the mercy of material force, that everywhere there prevailed a barbarous system of mutual terrorism, and pleaded for a tribunal of supreme arbitration as a means of suppressing militarism.⁶⁰

For his own country he predicted a future of vast import. "The Empire of Britain cannot be neutral upon this earth. Its mass is too great to incline this way or that without inclining the world as it sways. For good or evil it must leave its stamp upon the future. Under its shadow must spring up surpassing forms either of life or death. . . . The earth is girdled with our race, bearing forth with them the institutions, traditions, customs, the nerves, the intelligence, the endurance, the will of England. . . . Not without purposes in heaven is all this accomplishing. . . ." ⁶¹

In the *Dublin Review* for July, 1891, there appeared a study of the Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum* on Labour, issued a short time before by Pope Leo XIII, which may be regarded as Manning's valedictory as a thinker or student of social problems, or, as he himself phrased it, his "testament on the social question."⁶² There are grounds for the belief that Leo XIII was indebted to the Cardinal for inspiration and even information on the subject of the condition of the working classes. Of this more will be said in another connection. At present, space must be given to this study of Manning's, the first important commentary on a great document, a document issued more than a generation ago but which even now continues to interest and instruct. The president of the American Federation of Labour, Mr. Green, declared that in it the Pope showed "an understanding of his subject so thorough, penetrating and far-reaching that it embodies every phase of the principles of social justice and is as pertinent today as when it was written."⁶³

Cardinal Manning opened his discussion of the Encyclical "On the Condition of the Working Classes" in this way:

"Since the Divine words, 'I have compassion on the multitude,' were spoken in the wilderness, no voice has been heard throughout the world pleading for the people with such profound and loving sympathy for those that toil and suffer as the voice of Leo XIII. . . . Leo XIII, looking out of the watch-tower of the Christian world, as St. Leo the Great used to say, has before him what no Pontiff yet has ever seen. He sees all the kingdoms of the world and the sufferings of them."⁶⁴

In the analysis of the text of the Encyclical, Manning interspersed his own comment with illustrations from and inferences for the conduct of industrial relations in England. He contended that the Pontiff condemned both sections of the original orthodox Socialism, namely, the school which held the lawfulness of nationalising both land and wages of labour, and that which advocated the nationalisation of the land alone.⁶⁵

Yet the legislation of human society must be essentially social. Thus the intervention of the State in industrial affairs is in principle admitted. Manning took occasion to rejoice in the social legislation which had found its way to the statute books since the abolition of slavery in 1833, such as mining and factory legislation, the abolition of Corn Laws and the laws protecting children from noxious trades.⁶⁶

He concluded his comment with a discussion of the liberty, duties and coöperation of workers as expounded in the Encyclical. Man should be free to choose the conditions of his labour and if these be unsatisfactory to refuse to work—to strike. If a man accepted an insufficient wage through fear or necessity, he was a victim of injustice. Leo XIII, moreover, without naming anyone, warmly commended the works of those in France or elsewhere who were giving to their workmen a share in the profits and prosperity of their commerce and industry.⁶⁷

As regards the employment of women and children, the Cardinal quoted from the Encyclical and made his own comments. "Of women it [the Encyclical] says 'They are not suited to certain

trades: for a woman is by nature fitted for home work'—As we read these words the chainmakers of Cradley Heath, the pitbrow women of the mines, and the mothers in our factories rise before us. . . . Some people think that our statute law is of high perfection, because it forbids mothers to return to work for three weeks or a month after childbirth. By a higher law, the law of nature, the whole care and time of the mother is due to the child . . . it will be answered that without the mother's earnings the children would not be fed. To this there are many answers. The minimum of wages would suffice if the relations of capital and labour were even just, much more if generous. Already men have complained that employers prefer the cheaper work of women, and women are finding that employers prefer the cheaper work of children. It is the old formula of modern political economy, 'Sell in the dearest market, and buy in the cheapest.' . . . A normal state of wage-earning would put back every wife into her home in the midst of her children." ⁶⁸

Alluding to the Pope's condemnation of child labour, the Cardinal recalled the hideous conditions of fifty years before, over which the youthful half-timers of Lancashire and Yorkshire were an improvement. At Berlin the chief Powers and many lesser States had agreed to raise the minimum age for child labour to twelve years. The English after a year's delay had reluctantly raised it to eleven. "The words of Leo XIII will sear us till we raise it at least to twelve." ⁶⁹

In conclusion, Manning wrote: "For a century the Civil Powers in almost all the Christian world have been separating themselves from the Church, claiming and glorying in their separation. They have set up the State as a purely lay and secular society, and have thrust the Church from them. And now of a sudden they find that the millions of the world sympathise with the Church which has compassion on the multitude, rather than with the State, or the plutocracy which has weighed so heavily upon them." ⁷⁰

There was one brief passage in this study of the Encyclical which is not without a ring of personal reminiscence, whether or

not the author consciously had his own experience in mind: ". . . if any man would protect the world of labour from the oppression of 'free contracts' or 'starvation wages,' he is a Socialist. So obscure from want of thought, or so warped by interest, or so prejudiced by class feeling are the minds of men." ⁷¹

It is not difficult to see why a man of Cardinal Manning's enlightened views should be regarded by the hidebound economic conservatives, with their characteristic lack of humour and yet greater lack of knowledge, as a radical—and a dangerous radical at that. He was not the first social reformer to be denounced as a "Socialist" by people who disapproved of any attack on the citadel of Economic Liberalism. Nor was he to be the last. The word is still bandied about—at present in competition with "Bolshevist"—by loose thinkers and timid antagonists of even gradual social change; it is forever being bestowed by the unthinking on all those whose ideas on economic and sociological subjects are somewhat in advance of their own. Neither Marx nor Engels would have been eager to claim fellowship with many of those thus unceremoniously thrust into the household of their faith.

Manning was too practical to be a radical Socialist. In the face of actual sufferings to be assuaged, he wasted no time envisaging a Utopia; confronted with pressing labour problems he turned to arbitration or legislative action for their solution, awaiting no distant social revolution to bring the workers into their own. Socialism, moreover, was in its original types—though, of course, not necessarily in the multifarious and nebulous forms which it came later to assume—irreconcilable with the Cardinal's religious convictions. Catholics, believing as they do in a revealed creed and likewise in the free will of man, cannot consistently accept the Marxian doctrine of economic determinism, especially in the absolute way it was first expounded before Bernstein and the Revisionist school wrote some tempering glosses upon it. The extreme left wing of Socialism repudiates private property, and Catholics believe that private property is lawful and sanctioned by the teachings of Moses and of Christ. In addition, nearly all Socialists are eager to bestow upon the community, whether that be the national

state or some other unit of society, numerous powers which according to Catholic teaching should remain with the family or be vested in the individual citizen. That Manning, the most orthodox of souls, should be identified with such theories is not without its amusing aspect. He was quick to repudiate the connection, although he gloried in being a radical in the sense that his radicalism went down to the roots of the sufferings of the people.

Vaughan, Manning's successor in Westminster, had written to him from Rome in 1873:

"I fancy from what I hear that some complaint has been made about your going in with swaddlers, but they seem to understand and to appreciate our position better than formerly. I have dwelt upon the fact that our alliance must be with the people, and they have quite accepted it, and I ventured on the same thought with the Pope the other day."

"But," writes the latest and most scholarly of his biographers, "the cry 'This man goeth with swaddlers' followed Manning to the end of his social action." ⁷²

In the autumn of 1891, he told a correspondent of the *Gaulois* that he was absolutely opposed to Socialism as such, but that he agreed with certain demands which he thought were just. ⁷³

During the last years of his life, in the isolation and loneliness which were closing in around him and which were partly of his own creation, so independent of the counsel of others had he always been, the old Cardinal complained of the apathy of English Catholics. He compared the rather meager support in his good works which he received from them with the enthusiastic coöperation of his fellow-Anglicans in former days when, "I had only to lift up my hand and forty men sprang to my side ready to do my bidding." ⁷⁴

"The Jews," he once commented, "are taking better care of their working girls in the East End than we are. What are our people doing? Oh, I forgot; they have no time. They are examining their consciences or praying (with dear Mrs. Craven) for success in finding a really satisfactory maid." ⁷⁵

The most sweeping condemnation of the social lethargy of his

fellow Catholics is to be found in a striking passage opening with the words, ". . . all the great works of Charity in England have had their beginning out of the Church." He instanced the abolition of the slave trade and slavery, the temperance movement, the Acts against cruelty to animals and cruelty to children, the warfare against traffic in young girls, and social legislation in behalf of the working class. "It is not that our Catholics deliberately refuse, but partly they do not take pains to know, partly they are prejudiced. 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' partly they are suspicious 'who knows it is not a proselyting affair.' And finally they live on easily, unconscious that Lazarus lies at their gate full of sores." ⁷⁶

He had previously indicated their obligation to just such thought and activity—"The dictum of Terence: 'Homo sum et humani nihil a me alienum puto' is not repealed by 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' it is quickened, enforced, extended and elevated. Everything, therefore, that affects the human sufferings and state of the people, it is the duty of every civilised man to note and tend, much more of every Christian man, and above all of every Catholic man and woman, and emphatically of every priest and bishop. We cannot multiply loaves and heal lepers as our Lord did, by which the people were won to follow and learn of Him, but we can be prompt and foremost in working with all who are labouring to relieve every form of human suffering, sorrow, and misery. If we come forward gladly and usefully the people of this country are visibly glad to receive us among them." ⁷⁷

PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL REFORM MOVEMENTS: INTRODUCTION

Certainly nothing of human interest was alien to him, and he not only saw that the poor had the gospel preached unto them but that their temporal sufferings were lessened and many of the injustices under which they laboured removed. His was not a battle directed from behind the lines. From the first he was in the thickest of the fight. Preaching by action, as well as by word,

he lost no chance of joining with his Protestant and unbelieving countrymen in aiding philanthropic enterprises and movements for social reform.

In 1871 he was on the Mansion House Committee for the relief of the starving poor of Paris during the recent siege. There a resolution was passed requesting him to draw up an address to the Mayor of Paris expressing the sympathy of the people of London.⁷⁸

This was the beginning of his attendance at every public meeting held at the Mansion House for social or charitable purposes. In 1872, he presided over the International Prison Congress, stating on that occasion that he regarded it as his duty to preside as neutrally as possible. The chief speaker was Dr. Bellows, a Unitarian minister from New York. Manning eulogised his view on prison reform, adding as his own opinion that criminals should be treated singly and as children, and that due spiritual provision for them was no less necessary than some redress of their material hardships.⁷⁹

During the same year he addressed several meetings at the Mansion House in furtherance of "Hospital Sunday," the appeals being in behalf of the sick and suffering poor in London. He ordered an annual collection for "Hospital Sunday" in the diocese of Westminster.⁸⁰

In 1874, Manning presided at a meeting of the Society of Arts where the subject, "Thrift, or the Outdoor Relief Test," was discussed; and in 1875, addressing the Society of St. Vincent de Paul he expressed his regret that the membership was not greater.⁸¹

EDUCATION AND CHILD WELFARE

Ten years before, when Manning became Archbishop of Westminster and embarked on the career of social reformer which his previous life had but faintly foreshadowed, his first thought was for the children.⁸² To the disedification of some of the faithful, he turned his attention to their interests rather than to the immediate completion of the cathedral as a memorial to Cardinal Wiseman. Manning's original plan had been to have the memorial

to the late Cardinal take the form of giving education and care to the children of his diocese. But the influential members of his flock kept their eyes fixed on the vision of a cathedral at Westminster. To this project, Manning gave his approval and his contribution, but made an appeal for the cause that lay nearest his heart—the saving of the poverty-stricken, ignorant and neglected children of the London streets. He described his own course of action—"I said that I accepted it [the projected cathedral] with all my heart, but that first I must gather in the poor children. I hope I have kept my word, for I bought the land, and some thousands are given and others left for the building. But could I leave twenty thousand children without education, and drain my friends and my flock to pile up stones and bricks?" He recorded the result of his efforts: "The work of the poor children may be said to be done. We have nearly doubled the number in schools, and there is schoolroom for all. . . . My successor may begin to build a cathedral."⁸³

Convinced that every Catholic child should receive as his right a Catholic education, Manning in 1866 established the Westminster Diocesan Education Fund, thus increasing the number of children who received a Catholic education from 11,245 to 22,580; while £350,000 is the estimate of the sum eventually contributed to the Catholic Education Crisis Fund.⁸⁴

Zeal for the spiritual welfare of children led him to wage unceasing warfare on the principle of secular education which was first incorporated in English law in 1870 when Mr. Forster's Education Bill was introduced into the House of Commons. This measure established School Boards and set up schools which separated secular training from religion. It was Mr. Forster's intention that the Board schools, paid for out of the rates, should, to quote from the preamble of the Bill, "supplement and complete the religious and voluntary system." But others used the new principle as a means of attacking schools where religion was in any way introduced.⁸⁵

During the debate on the Education Bill of 1870, Manning was busy at the Vatican Council, or it is not unlikely that he might

have secured by judicious lobbying some modification of the measure. However, he called a meeting of the English bishops at the English College in Rome for the consideration of the subject, and, meanwhile, much to Mr. Forster's surprise, to which he later gave expression, the English Catholics did not try to obtain exemption from the operation of the law. As a matter of fact, Manning's own course at first was one of acquiescence in the new educational conditions. True, in a letter to Gladstone, he had expressed the fear that Catholics in England like those in America would be obliged to set up schools of their own; but before he left England for the Council he had, without securing the approval of the bishops, surrendered the right of a Catholic Inspector of Schools. In 1871, he insisted that the sum of more than £40,000 collected by Lord Edward Howard for poor schools be given only to those which had accepted the Government's terms.⁸⁶

In 1872 the Archbishop seems to have entertained the first doubts of the correctness of his course of action and began a rather tardy reversal of a policy which from the first seemed inconsistent and dangerous to many of his followers. In a Lenten Pastoral that year he deprecated the growth of the belief that education was the business of the State and not of the Church. Four years later, addressing a meeting at Nottingham, he said that no greater peril could hang over the country than the extension of the School Board System until it became the system of the country. A Pastoral in 1881 dealt with the same subject. Manning wished the voluntary schools to have a share of the support from the rates, a privilege exclusively enjoyed by the Board Schools. So chimerical did this proposal seem to the Catholic people of England that they refused to rally to the side of their archbishop in support of it, but left him to fight for his scheme practically alone, with a success commensurate with the zeal he threw into it and the formidable opposition he had to encounter.⁸⁷

"Is the Education Act of 1870 a Just Law?" was the title he gave to an article contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* in 1882. He did not advocate the repeal of the Act. To do so "would be like proposing the repeal of the Gregorian Calendar. We can-

not go back twelve days behind the rest of the world." He declared that the Act of 1870 was necessary, the population having outgrown all existing means of education. England, with its hundreds of thousands perhaps millions of uneducated children was behind both Germany and France, at least in the education of the lower and middle classes.

However, he thought that the present way of carrying out the Act was open to the censure of inequality or injustice. In the first place, the exclusive enjoyment and control of the education rate had been given to only one class of schools and that class representing a form of opinion repugnant to the majority, i.e. that education should be entirely secular. It was true that passages from the Bible were read, but this he pointed out, was very different from teaching religious principles. The Act of 1870 banished all doctrinal formulas and catechisms. "Religion without doctrine," he declared, "is like mathematics without axioms, or triangles without base or sides."

The school rate, he contended, pressed unequally on the rich and on the poor. Though the Board Schools were avowedly intended for the children of the poor, the latter were thrown upon the voluntary schools, the Board Schools being frequented chiefly by the children of the middle class. The poor, therefore, so far were paying for schools in which their own children were not taught, and the tradesman's children were educated on the rate paid also by the poor. Commenting on the sum of about £13,000,000 spent by the School Boards in ten years, Manning said that, though undoubtedly profuse and needless expenditures had been made, "nevertheless education is, if not the highest, at least inseparable from the highest interests and duties of a commonwealth . . . no amount of money really needed for the education of the millions that cannot pay for their own education ought to be thought too much," if only expended prudently "and if all who pay share equally in the benefit."

Finally, the injustice assumed still graver and more glaring aspects in view of the different manner in which voluntary schools and Board Schools had been dealt with since the passage of the

Act of 1870. Of the two sources from which public money went into the work of education,—the Consolidated Fund out of which since 1838 the Committee of Privy Council had been making grants to voluntary schools, and the school rate created by the Act of 1870,—in the grants from the first alone did both voluntary and Board Schools receive an equal share. From the school rate the voluntary schools were absolutely excluded. "In time past half the population was untaught because the secularists had not zeal and self-denial enough to found voluntary secular schools; and now they have been rewarded by an Act which endows schools without religion at the joint, if not the chief, cost of those who, by energy and generous self-denial, have created the national and Christian education of England mainly at their own cost." He called attention to the paltry nature of previous Parliamentary grants. Moreover, provision was made for the expansion of Board Schools which might be denied those of the voluntary system.

The remedies which he proposed he gave in two sentences. "Let a school rate or tax be levied over the whole population as a part of the general taxation of the country" and "Let all schools, with or without religious teaching, partake in the school rate, as they partake now of the grants of the Consolidated Fund, under all the conditions of the statute law and of the minutes and codes of the Committee of Privy Council."

He denied that this would be granting public money for religious teaching. By action of the Government, no religion could be taught in school hours and no religious books could be used in the voluntary schools. In the latter the religious instruction cost nothing. It was given gratis after school hours. The Government, therefore, in giving to these schools an equal share of the taxes would be paying for secular education alone. As to control and supervision, the writer was entirely willing that rate payers share with Government the inspection of the schools.

In conclusion, the Cardinal enumerated his reasons for believing in an extension of the Act of 1870. The people of the country as far as they had been able had pronounced against merely secular education. Public opinion had expressed itself in a demand for

the Bible in most of the Board Schools and in the support given to Anglican, Wesleyan and Catholic schools. The Parliament of 1870 had not been elected on the Education issue, but on a cry for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. The same Liberal temper which advocated the disendowment of religion looked with favour upon the endowment of secularism.

"We believe the great majority of the United Kingdom to desire religious and Christian schools. Why are they who say we are wrong in this belief so slow to let it be tested? . . . Let them . . . unite with us in putting it to the test. Let us unite in humbly praying that Her Majesty be graciously pleased to issue a Royal Commission to review the whole course of legislation in respect to education, with all the Acts of the Committee of Privy Council since 1838. . . . In 1882 the Christian schools of England may be placed upon the broad and common foundation of equality before the law. In 1892, if we are slack today, the time may be past forever."⁸⁸

Beginning in the year 1884 he worked in concert with the Voluntary Schools Association which included Anglican and Wesleyan bodies; and in 1885, on the question of education, he supported the Conservative candidates. Also in the same year he began his schoolmaster's superannuation scheme for the improvement of the position of the teachers in his diocese, and, preaching in the pro-cathedral on "The Future of the Schools," he quoted French and American writers to prove that the system of secular education was not a success in their countries. Manning's zeal for religious education, it may be noted in passing, was not in behalf of the Catholic schools alone. He believed that the preservation of the Christianity of England was bound up with the continuance of the alliance between religion and education.⁸⁹

Manning's interest in the Christian training of the young was given official recognition when he was made one of the members of the Royal Commission appointed by the Queen to inquire into and report upon the whole subject of primary education. Second on the list of those whom Her Majesty summoned to this commission was "our trusty and well-beloved, the most reverend

Cardinal Archbishop, Henry Edward Manning, Doctor in Divinity." When the Report appeared after a detail inquiry, numerous sessions and considerable changes in personnel, it recommended that the voluntary schools should be supported out of the rates. No immediate effort was made by legislative act to put the Report into effect, though Manning continued to support it and published in the *Fortnightly* a lengthy presentation of his side of the controversy which raged in England as a result of the Report of the Commission.⁹⁰

But the Free Education Act of 1891 which gave a new grant of 10s. per child in average attendance to replace the fees was very beneficial to Catholic education. Many Catholic children who had been admitted free before the passing of the Act as well as others who had paid only penny fees, amounting to hardly 3s. 6d. yearly, benefitted by this provision. Thus the Cardinal's cause triumphed in a way superior in its effects even to the sharing of the rates, which probably would have involved friction with the local authorities as well as a certain amount of local supervision, both of which were eliminated under the new arrangement.⁹¹

The importance of the part taken by Manning in bringing about this state of affairs can be surmised from the words addressed to him at the time of his episcopal jubilee, one year before, by Sir Francis Sandford "who declared that he felt from his heart that if England was to remain, so far as education was concerned, a Christian country, it would be to his Eminence that that result would be largely due."⁹²

Years before, in 1866, he had effectively protested against forcing Catholic children in unions (workhouses) to attend non-Catholic worship and learn non-Catholic catechism. He also secured from the Government important concessions for the free practice of their religion by Catholics in industrial schools and in the military and naval forces.⁹³

A brief chapter in the story of Manning's work for education, as well as in that of his relations with Gladstone, concerns itself with the proposal for an Irish University. This project, curiously

enough, had brought him into conflict with both the Conservative and the Liberal leaders. Referring to it, he said "Disraeli kept his head, but not his temper. Gladstone lost both." As a matter of fact, Manning approved of this bill which was introduced February 13, 1873, and wrote to Cardinal Cullen in behalf of it. It was the Irish hierarchy that killed the Bill. "This is not your fault, nor the Bill's fault," he wrote to Gladstone, "but the fault of England and Scotland and three anti-Catholic centuries."⁹⁴

Manning did not confine his interest in the welfare of children to what De Pressensé calls the "somewhat professional form of activity" in behalf of their religious education. Every work for the defence and protection of childhood found in him an enthusiastic advocate. He gave public support to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children founded in 1885 by the Rev. Benjamin Waugh, a nonconformist minister. In 1886 Manning, in collaboration with Mr. Waugh, contributed an article to the *Contemporary Review* recalling the excellent work already done by the Society, and in furtherance of additional legislation for the protection of children against the cruelty of parents and other adults.

"Cruelty to offspring people tacitly accept as the accompaniment of great poverty, squalor, and social misfortune; but the Society's work lends no sanction to that idea: it is almost the reverse of true. Against the poor, the terribly poor, it can bring hardly a complaint. As a class they seem full of a rough kindness which costs them much sacrifice. . . . The true English savage is often quiet, and is generally the earner of good wages. Squalor enough there is in his home, for he spends almost everything out of it upon himself."

The Society had secured the alteration of one law by which children of tender years would be permitted to give evidence in court if, in the opinion of the court or justices, such children were possessed of sufficient intelligence. Previously, the fact that these children were too young to take an oath had excluded most of such cases from the courts.

As to further legislation desired by the Society, the authors

suggested in the first place a law "to place the child of the savage on the same level as his dog. . . . At present the law explicitly forbids 'ill-treating, abusing, torturing and insufficient feeding' of dogs." As the law then stood a man's wife was not permitted to give evidence against a cruel husband on behalf of her child. This, too, should be changed. The Society further aimed for a limitation of the hours during which children—"generally the earners of drunken idle tyrants' livings" should be allowed to sell on the streets. The Society could then appoint a night officer. Meanwhile, interference would be illegal.

"We need a straightforward Draconian code against it [cruelty]. Today, boys and girls are being hurt, degraded, killed, that reckless men may sing songs to personal liberty, parental rights, and God knows what." ⁹⁵

Through the pages of the same magazine and in the same year in which in his comment on the Encyclical he had denounced child labour, Manning expressed the hope that the then pending Factories and Workshops Bill would be so amended as to raise the minimum age for child labour which stood at ten years. He gave extracts from correspondence and dispatches between Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, and Sir John Gorst, England's representative at the International Labour Conference at Berlin. In this correspondence, Salisbury gave Gorst authority to consent, among other proposals, to the raising of the minimum age of child labour to twelve years, and in mines to fourteen years. In view of this correspondence, Manning did not see how the Government Bill could ignore that vital question and urged the amendment proposed by Mr. Sydney Buxton, providing that after January 11, 1893, no child under eleven, and after January 1, 1894, no child under twelve, be permitted to work in a factory or workshop. This amendment had been rejected by a vote of 26 to 23. On that "disastrous result" Manning made "three remarks": (1) For the Government Bill to pass in its present state would indicate a departure from the position taken at the Conference and would place England on a lower level than those states—Germany, France, etc.—which had also given their assent and on the same

level with Spain and Italy which he declared were no examples for the greatest and most advanced industrial people of the world. (2) The way in which parents and legislators treat the children is a certain test of the civilisation of a land. The Commonwealth is bound to protect the rights of children whose parents are remiss in this duty. (3) The recent Commission on Education had by a unanimous vote recommended that the minimum age for the employment of children should be raised from ten to eleven years—probably a majority of the members desired it to be twelve. Moreover, the evidence laid before the Commission had proved that the half-time system hindered the acquisition of knowledge, disrupted the discipline of the schools and lowered their moral tone.⁹⁶

EARLY INTEREST IN THE LAND PROBLEM IN ENGLAND

Manning's first appearance as a social reformer on a public platform was at Exeter Hall in December, 1872, when he moved the first resolution at a meeting at the Agricultural Labourers' Union. He had been invited to preside but had declined on the ground of expediency, fearing lest the fact that they had a Catholic archbishop as Chairman be prejudicial to the interests of the union. Mr. Samuel Morley took the chair, and on the platform among others were Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Charles Trevelyan, Mr. Arch and Mr. Mundella. Archbishop Manning was the only ecclesiastic attending.

He explained his presence by the assurance he had received that only law-abiding and God-fearing methods were to be used. He felt qualified to speak on the subject: "For seventeen years I sat day by day in the homes of the labouring men of Sussex, and I knew them all and their children by name as well as I knew the scantiness of their means of subsistence." He complained that men were too much dominated by "the illusions of political economy" and regretted that the Report of the recent Royal Commission on Agricultural Labourers had not been translated into legislation. England, unlike Ireland, was benefit-

ing by no amendment of her land laws. He thought it should be made illegal to take land at 30s. an acre and relet it as "allotments" at four times as much.⁹⁷

Manning's action at Exeter Hall was not to pass without comment. Replying to Gladstone before the end of the year, he declared, "I have . . . lately had means of knowing what the agricultural unionists are. As yet they are not political. They do not coalesce with the London men, but the London men will soon make capital of them if others do not interpose. The consequence of this would be disastrous. My belief is that some energetic and sympathetic act on the part of Government would avert great dangers. Could not a Royal Commission be issued to take the evidence of men who are now appealing to public opinion for help? If they have a case it could be dealt with. If they have not, it would be exposed." And again:

"I wish I could be as sure about landed property as about personal. My belief is that the laws must be greatly relaxed." Continuing, he advocated the prohibition of the labour of children under a certain age, the payment of wages in money, the regulation of the number of dwellings according to the population of parishes and the establishment of tribunals of arbitration in counties for questions arising between labour and land.⁹⁸

Manning was accused of having "fanned the flame of agrarian agitation." To this he replied: "To couple my name with that of Mr. Arch gives me no displeasure. I believe him to be an honest and good man. I believe, too, that the cause he has in hand is well founded; and I confide in his using no means to promote it but such as are sanctioned by the law of God and the law of the land. I am sorry that the meeting at Exeter Hall was diverted from the purpose for which it was called and for which I attended it." Manning implied that he was one of the original promoters of the meeting. Hutton calls attention to his "remarkable foreshadowing of some of the ideas with which rural conferences have recently made men familiar."⁹⁹

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Purcell, E. S., *Life of Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster*, 2 vols. (London and New York, 1895), Vol. ii, p. 634.

² *Spectator*, Jan. 16, 1892.

³ Ward, W., *Ten Personal Studies* (London, 1908), pp. 275-298. The author makes a very thought-provoking comparison between Manning and Newman. "Newman had a philosophy of development, Manning a platform of Democracy," wrote Canon Barry in the *Tablet*, Mar. 19, 1921.

⁴ It has been pointed out that Newman's curious indifference to social problems can best be ascribed to the limitations of the human mind—everybody cannot do everything—and that his contribution to the realm of pure intellect eclipsed any service that he could have rendered to the cause of social reform. *America*, June 14, 1919.

⁵ Bodley, J. E. C., *Cardinal Manning and Other Essays* (London and New York, 1912), p. 16.

⁶ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 1-69; Leslie, S., *Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours* (London, 1921), pp. 1-34, p. 252; Bodley, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-52.

⁷ Lord Acton, a man of astounding erudition in the field of historical investigation, showed only the most casual interest in social reform measures. Gasquet, F. A., *Lord Acton and His Circle* (New York, 1906), pp. 130, 290, 329. His great contribution to society was like Newman's, in the intellectual sphere—consciously so, perhaps, for he wrote in 1859: "The task of raising the level of thought and learning amongst us is arduous enough to employ us for all our lives." *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁸ Taylor, I. A., *The Cardinal Democrat: Henry Edward Manning* (London, 1908), pp. 56-59; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 214-233; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 413-459; Ward, *op. cit.*, pp. 274-275; Bryce, James, *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (London, 1903), p. 256.

⁹ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 611-617; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 234-239, 192-213, 382-411; Lemire, *Le Cardinal Manning et son action sociale* (Paris, 1894), pp. 263-268.

¹⁰ *Month*, Vol. 137 (1921), pp. 481-493; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-315; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-326.

¹¹ Bodley, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

¹² Strachey, L., *Eminent Victorians* (London, 1918), pp. 3-115.

¹³ Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 252.

¹⁴ Lunn, A. H. M., *Roman Converts* (London, 1924), p. 122.

¹⁵ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 634, *et seq.* Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 11. For a consideration of Moses as a labour leader see Husslein, J. C., *Bible and Labour* (New York, 1924), pp. 33-43.

¹⁶ Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

¹⁷ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 635, 636.

¹⁸ *Tablet*, Feb. 6, 1892.

¹⁹ Thureau-Dangin, *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols. (London, 1914), Vol. ii, p. 331, pp. 421, 422.

²⁰ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 165 (1919), p. 1.

²¹ *Times*, Jan. 8, 1891.

²² Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 388.

²³ Manning, H. E., *The Subjects Proper to the Academia in Manning* (Editor), *Essays on Religion and Literature* (London, 1865), Vol. i, pp. 48-49.

²⁴ Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

²⁵ De Pressensé, F., *Cardinal Manning* (London, 1897), p. 209.

²⁶ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 389.

²⁷ Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

²⁸ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 637.

²⁹ Hutton, A. W., *Cardinal Manning* (London, 1892), p. 242; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 608.

³⁰ Burke, E. J., *Political Economy* (New York, etc., 1912), pp. 4, 5; de Pressensé, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

³¹ De Pressensé, *loc. cit.*; Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 389.

³² Manning, H. E., *The Dignity and Rights of Labour in Miscellanies* (London, 1877), Vol. ii, II. This lecture was reprinted with insignificant verbal changes in translation in the *Deutsche Revue* for March and April, 1890. It was revised and brought up to date in 1887.

³³ Manning, H. E., *Miscellanies*, 2 vols. (London, 1877), Vol. ii, pp. 71, 72, 74, 76.

³⁴ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 667.

³⁵ Manning, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

³⁶ Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.

³⁷ Manning, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-88.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-93. Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 162, 166, 167.

³⁹ Manning, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

⁴⁰ Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-178.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁴⁴ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁴⁵ Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

⁴⁶ Manning, *op. cit.*, pp. 96, 97.

⁴⁷ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁴⁸ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 14 (1885), p. 409, *et seq.* Manning was apprehensive of the consequences of concentrating land in the hands of relatively few persons: *Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 28 (1890), pp. 876-885.

⁴⁹ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

⁵⁰ *Times*, Feb. 2-7, 1888; *Tablet*, Feb. 4, 1888; *Ibid.*, Feb. 18, 1888.

⁵¹ *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. 13 (1888), pp. 193-198.

⁵² Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 208, 209.

⁵³ *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 49 (1888), pp. 153-156.

⁵⁴ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 664-671.

⁵⁵ Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 234, 236.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 140, 236, 243, 258.

⁵⁸ *Times*, Feb. 17, 1890.

⁵⁹ Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 222; *Dublin Review*, Vol. 109 (1891), pp. 162, 166.

⁶⁰ Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 223, 224.

⁶¹ *Tablet*, Jan. 23, 1892.

⁶² Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

⁶³ *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 9 (1925), p. 214. A copy of Pope Leo's Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, issued May, 1891, as well as his other letters and addresses on the social question may be obtained in convenient form in a volume published by the English Catholic Truth Society called *The Pope and the People* (London, 1920).

⁶⁴ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 109 (1891), p. 153. This study of the Encyclical was reprinted in *The Catholic Church and Labour* (Catholic Truth Society, London).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 163. Thirty-five years after Pope Leo expressed his views on the right to a living wage, labour troubles broke out among the lay employees of the Vatican as the result of dissatisfaction over wages. The gardeners went so far as to declare a strike. *New York Times*, July 20, 1926, Aug. 7, 1926, and Dec. 16, 1926. *New York Evening Sun*, Dec. 16, 1926.

⁶⁸ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 109 (1891), pp. 165, 166.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 166, 167.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 166, 167.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

⁷² Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

⁷³ *Times*, Nov. 13, 1891.

⁷⁴ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 714.

⁷⁵ Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 485.

⁷⁶ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 781.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 775-6.

⁷⁸ Purcell, *op. cit.*, p. 591; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

⁷⁹ Purcell, *op. cit.*, pp. 589-590.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 590.

⁸¹ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁸² Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 26. A few pages before this, the author makes the interesting comment that had Manning died at the age of 56 he would have been remembered as an ecclesiastic alone. He had, however, not been insensible to the suffering of the people. "Handlooms devour children," he had indignantly exclaimed when Rector of Lavington (Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 348); and, in a charge delivered in the year 1845 as Archdeacon of Chichester, he had declared that "Time must be redeemed for the poor man. The world is too hard upon him and makes him pay too heavy a toll out of his short life." (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 23.)

⁸³ Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-32.

⁸⁴ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 183; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

⁸⁵ Mr. Forster's Education Act of 1870 took its place in the Statutes of

the Realm as 33 and 34 Vict. c. 75; Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 330; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 492.

⁸⁰ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 492-494. Forster, in speaking years later to a Catholic friend said, "What fools you Catholics were not to claim exemption; for your schools were obviously outside the scope of the School Board System. The Jews were better advised and more on the alert, for they obtained what you did not even ask for." *Ibid.*, p. 493.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 494; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 172, 173.

⁸⁸ *Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 12 (1882), pp. 958-968.

⁸⁹ Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 37; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 173, 174; Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

⁹⁰ The report of the Royal Commission on Education may be found in the *Parliamentary Papers*, 1886 (c. 4863), v. 25; *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 51 (1889), pp. 732-756.

⁹¹ ——— 54 and 55 Vict. c. 56. This Act abolished fees in the elementary schools; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁹² Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 38. Any student of affairs not in sympathy with the Catholic ideal of education would regard Manning's zeal in behalf of voluntary schools as the one reactionary feature of his social action. With regard to higher education, the Cardinal carried his enthusiasm for an alliance between religious and secular training to a point to which great numbers of his coreligionists were unwilling to follow him. He opposed the attendance of Catholic students at the great English universities. But it was not his policy in this matter but that of Newman, who differed from him, that was destined to triumph.

⁹³ *Tablet*, Jan. 23, 1892; Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

⁹⁴ Morley, J., *William Ewart Gladstone*, 3 vols. (London, 1903), Vol. 2, p. 440. Further references on the subject of education during this period are to be found in: *Tablet*, July 3 and 10, 1869; *Dublin Review*, Vol. 18 (1872), pp. 409-440; *Tablet*, June 24, 1876; *Dublin Review*, new ser. v. 29 (1877), pp. 146-171; *La Réforme Sociale*, May 15, 1883. At the same time efforts were made to safeguard the interests of Catholic children in workhouses. *Tablet*, July 10, 1869, and May 29, 1875; *Times*, Nov. 11, 1891. Manning gave cordial support to schemes for the establishment of homes and clubs for working boys and girls. Oldcastle, J. (edit), *Letters on Subjects of the Day by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster* (Being the July, 1891, Number of *Merry England*, London), p. 32.

⁹⁵ *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 49 (1886), pp. 687-700.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 59 (1891), pp. 794-797.

⁹⁷ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 640, 641; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 190, 191, 255, 256.

⁹⁸ Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-350; *Tablet*, Sept. 21, 1889.

⁹⁹ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 641; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 191, 192.

CHAPTER II

MANNING IN THE THICKEST OF THE FIGHT

THE IRISH QUESTION

Enough has been written to prove Manning's love for the poor. He had a special affection for the Irish poor, strangers in a strange land, surrounded by multitudes of an alien religion or of no religion at all. He felt a spiritual obligation to concern himself with their welfare and as an Englishman he saw an opportunity to help redress some of the wrongs inflicted upon them. He loved them also for themselves, for their kindly and genial traits and for their age-long devotion to the faith which he held in common with them. "The Irish," to quote Mr. T. P. O'Connor, "responsive to his evident fondness for them, gave him a confidence and affection that almost approached to worship."¹

There is an interesting relation between the Irish question and the social question. The advocates of Home Rule and the members of the Irish Land League were face to face with one of the most serious economic problems ever presented for solution. Perhaps at the root of the difficulties between England and Ireland lay an economic injustice which was sometimes lost sight of in the religious issue, and at times played a sort of "second lead" to the propaganda for the realisation of Irish nationality. But it could never be ignored, although enemies of Irishmen's rights had invoked religion to obscure it—"Great is Diana of the Ephesians!"

The agitation for Home Rule took cognisance of a very realistic situation while making emotional appeals to the sentiment of historic nationhood. But the Land League struck directly at the economic evil. Its members looked for state intervention between the despoiled peasants and the predatory proprietors, demanding

that society place itself on the side of the weak that social justice might prevail and ancient wrongs be righted. The friends of Ireland in England saw that in the land question lay the most prolific source of Irish discontent. Many other evils, to be sure, attended it. Liberty, the right of association and other civil and political rights had become the monopoly of a caste.²

Manning's attitude toward the Irish question on its political side underwent a curious metamorphosis. He was at first unfriendly not only to Fenianism, the extreme manifestation of the Irish flair for "self-determination," but to the more temperate and orderly movement for Home Rule as well. Fenianism, which, in so far as its object was complete national independence, may be regarded as the precursor of Sinn Féin, he early denounced as sinful. Separatism, in fact, never elicited his sympathy. With Home Rule it was different. His first aversion to the Nationalist movement arose from his unwillingness to see a separate legislature set up in Ireland. In a letter to Pope Leo, dated February 17, 1885, occurred this passage: "As for myself, Holy Father, allow me to say that I consider a Parliament in Dublin and a separation to be equivalent to the same thing. Ireland is not a colony like Canada, but it is an integral and vital part of one country, or, as it is often described, of the Mother Country."³

When, however, a year later, Home Rule was first espoused by Gladstone, the cause found in Manning an earnest supporter. Even then he did not relish the idea of removing the Irish members from Westminster, fearing that their loss would work to the detriment of the interests of the English Catholics. He was present in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery on the occasion of Gladstone's oration on Home Rule. At the conclusion of the speech, Manning, surrounded by the Irish members, exclaimed, "We cannot spare one of you." These words were a faithful reflection of his feelings. There might, however, be some way out of the difficulty. In a letter to Vaughan, written in the same year, he signalled his adherence to "The integrity of the Imperial Parliament and a legislative power in Ireland for all home matters not Imperial." When the shadow of the fateful tragedy of Parnell

overcast the whole Irish cause, Manning urged, on moral grounds, the repudiation of its leader.⁴

Politics constituted but one phase of the Irish question. It had its economic and social aspects as well, and those, as might be expected, Manning was not slow to see. In a long letter to Earl Grey written in 1868, he showed his good will toward the Irish and his fervent wish to see their burdens lightened. Early in its pages he took occasion to protest against a certain type of attitude which could not fail to be productive of harm. "Your Lordship's [ie., Earl Grey's] treatment of these subjects has always been distinguished by a respectful and sympathetic manner towards Ireland; but I have been at a loss to conceive what certain of our public writers can hope to effect by the cynical, sarcastic disdain with which they treat that noble-hearted people. One of the most recent and melancholy examples of this, which I must call a public crime, may be found in the last article of the January number of the *Quarterly Review*. In that article, a writer of no ordinary abilities has exhibited, I hope as a warning to us all, how bitter, narrow, and unjust the spirit of party can make even a powerful mind. I call this a public crime because it does more to create bad blood between the two countries than even graver wrongs. The grievances of a people may produce discontent but a tone of imperial contempt goads high-spirited men to madness." It may be noted in passing that, in the mind of the writer in the *Quarterly*, the one grievance of the Irish was that they, and not the English government, had to pay for their religion.

According to Manning the causes of the just discontent of the Irish were to be sought in religious inequality and abuses with regard to the land. "So long as there exists upon the statute-book any penal enactment against the Catholic religion; so long as the Catholic people of Ireland are deprived of a 'bona fide' Catholic education; so long as a Protestant Church Establishment is maintained by law over the face of Catholic Ireland; and so long as the people of Ireland fail to derive from the land such a subsistence as the labourers and farmers of England and Scotland derive from the soil: there must be a just discontent, which will be the misery

of Ireland and the danger of England." Property which had been taken from the Catholic Church should, in his opinion, be restored not to it but to the poor. The Church did not desire State endowment.

With reference to the land question, he asserted that, in accordance with the law both natural and divine, each people had a right to live of the fruits of the soil in their own land. The rights of private property were checked by considerations for the general good, and in no case could they be interpreted to permit injury to one's neighbour. Legal right and justice were sometimes far from being synonymous terms. The property in the soil created by tillers and tenants, belonged to them and not to the landlords who held the legal title. In their distress the Irish people looked to Parliament for a redress of grievances. The Land Question Manning described as a heartless euphemism which meant in truth "hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labour spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes; the miseries, sicknesses, deaths of parents, children, wives; the despair and wildness of the poor when legal force, like a sharp harrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital rights of mankind." ⁵

In 1870 while the first Irish Land Bill of the century was pending in the English Parliament, Manning in a private letter to Gladstone asked for fixity of tenure and judicial rents. The Archbishop of Westminster and the great Liberal leader could join forces on the issue of land reform for Ireland.⁶

Concerning the same vexing problem, Manning, writing to Childers ten years later, said, "Of course we must safeguard the rights of landlords to compensation, but while doing this and condemning crime, I think we ought to go in for a generous settlement of this Irish grievance." ⁷

In receiving a deputation of agricultural labourers in July, 1881, who came in the interests of the Irish Land Bill, then before Parliament, the Cardinal told them of his deep sympathy with the cause of the Irish tenants and labourers and approved the Land League, provided that it operated within the limits of the law, human and divine. On this occasion he advocated the setting up of

a Royal Commission to take evidence on the state of the labourers alone. There should, he maintained, be a law to force those who had an interest in the land to provide proper houses for the labourers, and each labourer should possess with his house, however little, an allotment of land. There seemed to him three questions absolutely requiring due consideration: housing, allotments and rate of wages. He expressed his belief in the desirability of a peasant proprietorship upon the largest possible scale, in this way creating a class analogous to the yeomanry of England. Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which secured Fair Rent, Fixed Hold and Free Sale, he regarded as the best means of attaining that end.⁸

Manning's public expression of opinion on the Land League did not meet with the unanimous support of his coreligionists, one of whom wrote to the *Times* to "deprecate any political opinions of his Eminence being regarded as the general views of Catholics, clerical or lay . . . the public regard a man of profound piety and zeal like the Archbishop of Westminster as our public spokesman, but we, absolutely one in faith, are not bound to approve his politics. Perhaps the less English Catholics as such have to do with politics, but especially Irish politics, the better."⁹

During a period of distress in Ireland in the spring of 1883 Manning circulated a letter appealing for contributions for the relief of the poor, which met with a generous response.¹⁰

On April 20, 1888, the Holy See condemned the Plan of Campaign and the practice of boycotting, both greatly misunderstood weapons which had been used by the Irish in their desperate efforts to restore the economic balance upset by their oppressors. Manning's comment was:

"The Decree of Leo XIII was absolutely true, just, and useful. But in the abstract. The condition of Ireland is abnormal. The Decree contemplates facts which do not exist. The political condition of the world is not contained in the deposit. Pontiffs have no infallibility in the world of facts, except only dogmatic. The Plan of Campaign is not a dogmatic fact, and it is one thing to declare that all legal agreements are binding, and another to say that all agreements in Ireland are legal."¹¹

In a short section of his book, Lemire develops the ingenious theory that the presence of an Irish group among the people with whom Manning had to deal in London was of great strategic benefit to the Cardinal. They were the contingent of believers, the faithful to whom he could always appeal and by them lead on the rest—the sacred battalion through whose unfailing fidelity he could win the battle. Of this the Dockers' Strike furnished the outstanding example.¹²

Be that as it may, he made the cause of the Irish, whether in Ireland or England, his cause, and foresaw its ultimate triumph. Writing to Mr. W. O'Brien he said, "The day of restitution has nearly come . . . when the people of Ireland will be re-admitted, so far as is possible, to the possession of their own soil, and shall be admitted, as far as possible, to the making and administration of their own local laws while they shall still share in the legislation which governs and consolidates the Empire."¹³

TEMPERANCE

One of the most important philanthropic works in which Manning engaged was his somewhat spectacular but extremely successful campaign against the vice of drunkenness. Even before his interest was aroused by the United Kingdom Alliance, he appointed a committee to inquire into the subject of drink and to recommend the means to be employed in combatting the evil. His first real inspiration seems to have come from a deputation of the United Kingdom Alliance who, in 1867, "came to my house, and the arguments they laid before me aroused my attention, and from that day I trace the whole knowledge that I possess, and I may say an intense feeling of indignation, and the resolution, as long as life lasts, never to stint or spare in word or deed to help the United Kingdom Alliance."¹⁴

He associated himself with the "permissive prohibition" policy of the Alliance, which was a sort of local option. As Manning himself explained it when he spoke before a meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance at Manchester in October, 1868, a permissive

act would enable localities or municipal bodies, by their own vote, to prevent the issue of licenses to sell liquor. On that occasion Manning complained that fourteen years had passed since the selection of the Parliamentary committee of 1854, and nothing had been done to put its recommendations into effect. "In these fourteen years," he declared, "not only has the evil increased but the capital invested has been increased. . . . I will remind you that with the investment of the capital the political influence is increasing; the dominion over Parliament and over the constituencies is increasing." The recently appointed committee of 1868 of the House of Commons he regarded as an unhappy contrast to that of 1854, for the former had declared drunkenness to be on the decrease when those in a position to know, like doctors and clergymen, could attest otherwise. While disclaiming a belief in absolute prohibition, he wished the Permissive Bill to be passed into law, declaring that he looked upon it as no more than giving a legal right and power to the people of the country to protect themselves.¹⁵

Illustrative of the spirit in which he approached the subject are the words he uttered in an address before the public meeting of the Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association at Glasgow on September 24, 1872: "I hope the United Kingdom Alliance will go on vigorously, resolutely and without fear. It does us no harm to be called fanatics. It breaks no bones to be laughed at." It was well that he took this stand, for the non-Catholic enemies of his zeal for total abstinence were to question his motives, and his Catholic enemies to regard his conduct as either too extreme or not sufficiently genteel.

The economic aspect of the thing was, as usual, not lost upon him. "The industry of this country is at this moment paralysed by drink. I believe it perfectly certain that those who say that drink of this kind is necessary for food would be abundantly supplied by it if one-fourth of the one hundred and ten millions were given to this purpose. The other three fourths of that enormous capital would employ every unoccupied hand now supported by the Poor Law." It would extinguish pauperism. The

vast amount of money expended in the drink traffic—£200,000,000 annually, it had been said,—would, he claimed, if applied to productive industry, be doubled every year. As to the moral ravages of drink, he declared that it was “devouring men, women, children and homes.”¹⁶

Additional reference will be made shortly to his views on temperance legislation. But first attention must be given to his outstanding work for total abstinence—“the crown of all Cardinal Manning’s labours as a philanthropist,” Purcell calls it—the organisation and development of the League of the Cross which he launched in the year 1872. Its official title was the Roman Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross, and in its formation Manning worked in conjunction with Father Nugent of Liverpool. This device by which he infused much of his own spirit into others was something of a stroke of genius, for it took into account in a most ingenious way certain characteristics of human psychology, and more especially that of the Irish people who constituted so large a percentage of the Cardinal’s London flock. People are strengthened in resolution by association with their like-minded fellows in clubs or societies of some sort. Manning took this instinct fully into account when he provided with an organisation those pledged to total abstinence from alcoholic drinks. Moreover, few people are unresponsive to the appeal of pageantry; and even when they think themselves too mature to admit it, they feel the enthusiasm evoked by the sight of marching columns, with bands playing and colours flying. The League held annual demonstrations at the Crystal Palace, and there was much parading and beating of drums. Finally, tearing a leaf from the book of the Salvation Army leaders, Manning invested the officers of his League with such high sounding military titles as “general,” “major” or “captain,” and, making them his special “Body-guards,” he adorned each with a gorgeous red sash. Between him and the Irish members of the League was the strong bond of loyalty to a common faith. This, too, he considered and made use of, as is evidenced by “The Truce of St. Patrick” which made of the national festival a day of dignified rejoicing and

sobriety, as the "Truce of God" in the Middle Ages had sanctified the Sabbath from bloodshed.¹⁷

Manning addressed meeting after meeting in behalf of temperance, enlisting the children as well as adults in the cause. He wrote in 1888 to Father Flood of Athlone, "I hope all fathers and mothers will bring up their children in total abstinence. It is not only a guard against many and the deadliest temptations, but it is a counsel of a higher life, which teaches temperance in all things and lifts our will up to desire and to do better things." His first visit on his return to England after the death of Pius IX in 1878 was to St. Anne's Spitalfields, to enroll five hundred working boys, girls and children in the League of the Cross.¹⁸

Meanwhile the press carried news items of the meetings at which he spoke, in spite of the remonstrances of those of the faithful who, more distinguished for their eminent respectability than for their Christian charity, were convinced that a cart on Clerkenwell-green was not a very dignified pulpit for a Prince of the Church. At Exeter Hall on March 23, 1874, he quoted the excise and customs returns to show how great was the increase in the consumption of spirits. The fact that more than a hundred millions was invested in the liquor trade in England was proof of its strength.¹⁹

He spoke in the interest of the movement for the closing of public houses on Sunday at a meeting of the Liverpool Catholic Temperance League, August 23, 1875. Three years later, referring to the passing of the Irish Sunday Closing Bill, he congratulated Ireland on what had been accomplished. Shortly before Christmas in 1876, he wrote a Pastoral to be read in all the churches of the archdiocese of Westminster, desiring his clergy to warn their flocks against the vice and sin of drunkenness.²⁰

Among a series of notes written in 1890—the year in which he brought all his journals and diaries to a close—is found one on the League of the Cross. He reviewed the strength of the organisation with its London branches over forty in number and his fourteen hundred Guards and hundreds of boy Guards, and remarked with satisfaction ". . . The League has taken hold

of the people, especially the working men. It was this that gave me a hold in the Strike of last year, not only of my own men but also of the Englishmen who were as two to one. I pray God that my successor will humbly and with his whole heart go into the midst of the people as I have tried to do—and will give to the League of the Cross a warm and encouraging countenance.”²¹

In articles which he wrote for the chief magazines and reviews, Manning reverted to efforts made to secure legislation to limit in some way the evils of the drink traffic. “We are told by a great authority,” he informed the readers of the *Dublin Review*, “that the calamities of war, pestilence and famine do not equal the miseries which spring from intoxication. . . . Men have different minds as to the remedy; but all agree that a remedy must be found. . . . No license ought to take effect in any place or parish, even the humblest hamlet, against the will of the people. It is they who suffer; it is their homes that are wrecked; their sons and daughters that are demoralised. . . . They have to pay for all its harvest of miseries by local and county rates. . . . Let the people speak for themselves. Their name is taken in vain; and the plea for a new public-house is that the people want it. Ask them and let them say so.”²²

“Our National Vice” was the way in which the Cardinal stigmatised intemperance in intoxicating drink in a treatment of the subject under that caption in the *Fortnightly Review*. Unfortunately, intemperance was a “national tradition” and “an inheritance of more than a thousand years,” and for the past three hundred years “the legislative enactments have resulted in a system of licensing laws of which it will not be too severe a sentence to say that all their barriers have been overwhelmed and swept away in the swelling flood of intoxicating drink.” . . . “But,” he wrote, “these evils might perhaps have been brought within some control were it not for two causes.” He then gave the causes: drink was a source of investment for capital which might become a monopoly, and the Government raised by it an immense revenue. In regard to the first cause the Cardinal declared that the capital employed in the drink trade was a

monopoly held by some hundreds of distillers and wine merchants, some thousands of brewers and publicans, all of whom numbered nearly half a million and with their servants covered the entire country. As to the complicity of the government, "It is certain that the most ascetic chancellor of the Exchequer will go on resting in confidence on the tax on intoxicating drink. His interest in its prosperity is only second to the interest of the great monopoly."

How was the national vice to be corrected? And by whom? For its correction, Manning put his faith in the common people. The efforts of government officials had failed through their remoteness from the people, and coercive power defeated itself. The necessary dynamic force had never been found in the upper classes who "are too far removed from the life of the people . . . ; or are directly interested as capitalists, or as possessors of house property; . . . or are too delicate to touch so vulgar a subject . . . it is only in the spontaneous action of the people, rising with their high moral sense in reaction against the system which has so long made their homes so desolate and their lives intolerable, that an adequate remedy can be found." The onward movement of public opinion and the development of the moral sense of the people made it inevitable that they obtain from Parliament the right to have a local vote on the question of public-houses similar to that which they already possessed in the matter of education.

In referring to a statement in the *Pall Mall Gazette* that if women could vote, the Permissive Bill would be passed at once, the Cardinal said, "Nothing can be more certain; for as our national vice wrecks the domestic life of the people, it is upon the women of the United Kingdom that the full and fierce misery springing from intemperance falls in its dire intensity."²³

On another occasion Cardinal Manning, discussing the causes and responsibility for the wreck of humanity, named three things: the destruction of domestic life due primarily to bad housing conditions, intoxicating liquor, especially the drink trade, and the absence of the moral law resulting largely from the relatively few

churches in England. The drink trade he called "a public, permanent, and ubiquitous agency of degradation to the people of these realms," and it had, he added "a sleeping partner who gives it effectual protection. Every successive Government raises at least a third of its budget by the trade in drink."²⁴

In 1888 he made an attack upon the Compensation Clauses in the Local Government Bill then pending, which would make it impossible to withdraw or refuse to renew a publican's license without compensating him for the increase in the value of his property due to the license, in this way creating a vested interest in licenses, or a right to compensation if one be refused.

The Cardinal was very much in favour of the other features of the Local Government Bill as tending to relieve the country of a too great centralisation which had resulted in a Parliament cluttered with a mass of legislation with which it was impossible to deal. "But these bright hopes were rudely destroyed by the clauses which place the great drink traffic at the very outset of the Bill, as if it were the palladium of our liberties and the most vital interest of the Commonwealth.

"The reaction which has set in, not against the high and statesmanlike structure of Local Government, but against the housing, establishing and endowment of the drink trade under the Imperial roof in this wise extension of the English Constitution, is widespread and profound."²⁵

Together with Mr. W. S. Caine, M. P., Cardinal Manning again attacked "Compensation for Licenses," two years later, this time in the *Contemporary Review* in an article of which he wrote the first part and Mr. Caine the second.

Manning appealed to the public opinion and public conscience of the country, including the Government itself, to obtain the excision of the licensing clauses of Mr. Goschen's Budget which was about to be acted upon by Parliament. Mr. Ritchie had introduced a Bill for County Government, two years earlier, containing similar licensing clauses which caused its overwhelming defeat. The Cardinal considered the legal and economic aspect of the temperance question, and the moral consequences should

the Government become a party to the drink trade by adopting the licensing clauses of Mr. Goschen's Budget, which would increase the revenues of the Government at the risk of lending protection to the owners of public-houses by compensating them whenever their licenses were taken away. He quoted sections from Parliamentary Acts and court decisions to prove that a license was never regarded in the light of a vested interest, and could not properly be called a renewal even though a new license was granted every year.

But was it just to put a man out of a lawful trade, on which he had lawfully entered, without compensation? Yes, retorted the Cardinal, if he entered upon it knowing his tenure was for one year only, and upon the tenure of one year had made extravagant outlay. There should be no compensation for imprudence. Furthermore the publican had more than compensated himself by the large profits he made from the business.

Manning concluded with some quotations from an article of Mr. Caine's, about to be republished, showing the enormous profits accruing to the Drink Trade from such an arrangement as that contemplated in the Budget. For example, "a house in Liverpool with a license worth £2,000 was bought by a brewer for £10,500. The compensation (in case the license were withdrawn) would be £8,500!"²⁶

Summing up the result of this activity, one of the Cardinal's biographers states: "The withdrawal of the Government's scheme for compensating dispossessed publicans (1890) was reckoned as due in great measure to the imposing forces that Cardinal Manning was able to marshal in opposition to it."²⁷

As to the fate of the Permissive Bill, it was not until after the death of both its friends—the Cardinal and Sir Wilfrid Lawson—that, through the Licensing Bill of Mr. Asquith, an effort was made to give to the people the power for which each in his own way had striven.²⁸

After the Cardinal's death, amongst the numerous resolutions of regret at his passing came words of appreciation for his unabating zeal against the liquor traffic from The Committee of the

British Women's Temperance Association and The Committee of the London Auxiliary of the United Kingdom Alliance.²⁹

The Bishop of Newport in his panegyric paid this last great tribute to Cardinal Manning's work for temperance:

"He knew well that though drunkenness is a curse, yet there are worse and darker sins. But he also knew that if he could rescue his flock from the sin of excessive drink, situated as they were, he could do nothing better for them. And thousands have blessed his words, his efforts, and that personal asceticism which spread the sacred fire of temperance throughout the country. Shall the fire die out? Shall the crusade melt away? No; but other hands will take it up, and other voices—not his, yet earnest, too, and persuasive—will bring his words back as the years go on; and, like the bones of the twelve Prophets, his honoured remains will 'spring up out of their place' to strengthen pastors and people in the noble cause which he has made his own more than any man, perhaps, of this generation."³⁰

THE HOUSING PROBLEM AND POOR RELIEF

It will be recalled that Manning in his comment on the Irish Land Bill had referred to the need of legislation to secure better housing provisions for the working classes. He was always keenly interested in this problem and it was not surprising, therefore, that he was named a member of a Royal Commission to inquire into the subject in March, 1884, public interest having been aroused by some fearful revelations in regard to the wretchedness of the dwellings in certain districts of London.³¹

The chairman of this commission was Sir Charles Dilke and the very substantial Report issued as "of great urgency" in 1885 was in a great measure their joint work. The extent of the Cardinal's interest can best be gauged by the statement of Mr. J. E. C. Bodley, the secretary of the Commission: "The Report on the Housing of the Working Classes which I wrote under his eye has become a text-book in that unsound branch of Economics." It was significant that next to the name of the

heir to the Crown, that of Cardinal Manning appeared in the royal warrant issued by the Secretary of State, a position assigned to him as a personal tribute. Amongst the other members were Lords Salisbury and Goschen; Sir George Harrison, Lord Provost of Edinburgh; Bishop Walsham Howe; and Mr. Samuel Morley. As a member of this Commission, Manning was punctilious in attendance, and assiduous in putting questions to witnesses under examination.³²

He did not, however, try to introduce his opinions in the text of the Report, except in public discussion before the entire Commission, although he had the draft read privately to him. The Report was issued in 1885 in two large volumes and is an almost exhaustive recital of all the housing reforms which have been urged upon Parliament either then or later—except, of course, the recent movements in favour of town planning, garden cities and garden suburbs. The Report called attention to the appalling overcrowding and unsanitary conditions of the slums of large towns and recommended the reduction of rents, the encouragement of building societies or free construction societies, the erection of healthful homes and of houses for the very poor, with supervision of hygiene and propriety and a check on taverns and other dangerous establishments.³³

Unfortunately, this excellent Report, so earnestly and thoughtfully compiled, found no immediate adequate legislative expression. The publicity given intolerable conditions, especially as a result of the evidence of the Earl of Shaftesbury, could not, however, fail to bring about some legislative remedy. The Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890 was doubtless inspired in some degree by the findings and recommendations of the Commission of 1884. Even it fell far short of the ideal set up by the Commission. It was not until the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1909 that fundamental reform was introduced.³⁴

In his enumeration of the three great reasons for the wreck of humanity, Manning placed beside drink and the absence of the moral law, the destruction of domestic life which, he claimed, was due primarily to bad housing conditions. While the Commission

was sitting, repeated efforts were made to set on foot an inquiry into the number of people inadequately housed. The reason why such an inquiry was held to be impossible he had never been able to ascertain. "But Governments seem to shrink from the trouble or the expense of inquiry. . . . The number of families living in one room only is less indeed now than a few years ago; but the number of families of from five to ten persons living in two rooms . . . is still very great. . . . Anyone who heard or has even read the evidence taken before the Housing Commission will never forget it. . . . I refer to the report of the Commission, and to the evidence of Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Horsley, and gladly refrain from explicit details." ³⁵

Speaking at the Mansion House Conference three months after the Commission had been appointed, he pointed out that the poor should be brought to a realisation of what was necessary for the sanitary condition of their houses. He admitted the frequent ineffectiveness of Royal Commissions but thought he saw an exception in the present one. The Report should lead to legislation, but behind the legislation there must be "dynamic power" amongst the people themselves. In the extension of local self-government he saw a real cure for the evils because there were already on the Statute Books acts adequate for their repression. Finally, he looked to the people in London who had been recently aroused to the consciousness of an intolerable evil to continue their interest in and support of the movement and to find a "full and complete remedy for these sufferings of the population." ³⁶

The Cardinal took a prominent part in promoting measures to relieve the widespread distress amongst the poor in London during the winter of 1887-88. A Mansion House Relief Fund having been denounced by political economists as demoralising, he thought the Government ought to take action, not only to organise relief for the unemployed and their families and the old and feeble, but to devise remedies to prevent a recurrence of so terrible a calamity. To this end he joined Lord Compton's Committee on the Distress in London and on the first of February, 1888, attended a deputation to Lord Salisbury.

Manning was well abused for this alleged advocacy of Socialistic theories and we have seen how he defended himself in the *Times* against the strictures and criticism of Mr. Robert Giffen of the Board of Trade. Others recognised the value of his ideas and labours. For instance, the Governor of New South Wales, Lord Carrington, wrote him a letter from which the following extract is taken:

“ . . . I venture to send you a line to wish you all happiness for the New Year, and to say how eagerly and with what interest I read of your efforts to help the poor in London. . . . in laying the foundation of the Trades Hall, I did what I could to bring the subject of overcrowding and all its horrors before the people in time; as Sydney will in years to come, with all its natural advantages, become an immense city.”

During the spring and summer of 1888, Manning had frequent conferences with Lord Compton and others interested in relieving the trying times. In the autumn of the year Compton in a letter to the Cardinal confessed to a failure to arrive at any means of relieving the situation. In publicity alone he saw a gleam of hope.⁸⁷

THE DOCKERS' STRIKE

In 1889 occurred the famous Dockers' Strike, in the settlement of which Cardinal Manning was to play so conspicuous a part, this intervention being the most memorable episode in his social work. The dockers, “the hungry men who carried the food of London” numbered with allied workers about two hundred thousand and constituted, as they themselves said, the forlorn hope of the army of labour—the outcasts excluded from all the trades, former sailors, deserted soldiers, excavators and coachmen without work. The labour was casual and poorly paid. Moreover, the dockers had permitted exploiters to come between them and the company directors. These intermediaries applied the sweating system to the labourers in order to make up by the quantity of the task the meagerness of its remuneration. The workers were

unskilled—two brawny arms alone sufficed for the performance of their tasks—and until the eve of the Strike had been unorganised. To complicate the situation further, the dock directors employed a greater number of men than was necessary and had created in the public mind what later proved to be an erroneous impression, namely, that they were making enormous dividends.³⁸

Under the leadership of John Burns and his capable confrères, the dockers were able to present a united front to the world. On August 13th, three hundred men refused to accept their wages and by the twentieth the strike had become general and soon extended to allied trades, paralysing the industrial life of the great port of London. The men demanded sixpence an hour instead of five pence, employment for a minimum of four successive hours (previously, they had been engaged at times for only one or two hours) and the abolition of the contract system.³⁹

After a fortnight neither side showed any sign of yielding. The directors had refused the demands of the men. The money which was to pour in upon them from sympathisers, even in far off Australia, had not yet begun to arrive, and the families of the strikers faced destitution. There had also loomed up a widespread danger to the whole industrial life of England in the form of a no-work manifesto which had been issued on August 29th calling for a general sympathetic strike. These considerations, together with his fear of damage to the port of London either by immediate destruction or by the ultimate deflection of capital from it, impelled Manning to intervene. In his comment on the Encyclical, he made brief allusion to those dangerous days: “. . . for a month the streets of London were choked day by day with processions of tens of thousands. Disorders and horse-play, which at any moment might turn to collisions with the people or the police, were imminent; these were sharpened by disappointment, and irritated by refusal of an additional penny an hour. At any moment a drunkard, or a madman, or a fool might have set fire to the docks and warehouses. The commercial wealth of London and the merchandise of the world, the banks and wharves of the Thames, might have been pillaged; and the conflagration might have spread

for hours before order, at unimaginable loss, could be restored. And all this because a strike 'is a matter between us and our men.' " 40

On August 30, a sympathiser saw the Cardinal, bringing him news of the strikers. "Then," she said, "I went away to fetch a list of the Dock Directors. . . . I had the satisfaction of seeing him drive off in his carriage to the City." The Lord Mayor and the Home Secretary were out of town; so Manning, accompanied by Sir Andrew Lusk, the mayor's Deputy, went to Dock House and there addressed the directors—but to no purpose. The return of the Mayor and the appearance of the Bishop of London made possible a distinguished committee of reconciliation. One of them, Lord Buxton—on whom with Manning fell most of the responsibility for the negotiations—tells how the Cardinal spent "day after day from ten in the morning till seven or eight at night interviewing, discussing, negotiating, sometimes waiting hour after hour patiently but anxiously at the Mansion House. He never appeared disheartened or cast down. He was always confident that with time, tact, and patience, peace would speedily prevail." 41

The committee after consultation with the leaders of the strike were impressed by the justice of the demands of the men but believed that an interval should be allowed the directors before the new schedule of wages—the famous dockers' "tanner," or 6d. per hour—should go into effect. It was on this issue that the negotiations almost came to naught, and it was his settlement of this disturbing question that won for the Cardinal his chief claim to the gratitude of the English people.

April first was suggested and was flatly refused by the men. March first was likewise rejected. "I appeal to your Eminence," said Burns—"have the men not behaved with sweet reasonableness?" "My son, they have," replied the Cardinal. "Then I do not think they ought to be asked to wait till March." The first of January was finally agreed upon as the day when the increase in pay of a penny an hour was to go into effect. The Lord Mayor, the Cardinal and the Bishop of London waited upon the dock directors that evening, and urged an acceptance which was

reluctantly given at four o'clock on the following day, on condition that the strikers acceded that same evening.⁴²

Burns and Tillett went with the news to the strike committee. To the anxious watchers there came silence—and then a manifesto repudiating what the two leaders had accepted. The directors and the Bishop withdrew in their chagrin; and for a time the Cardinal was left to brave the crisis alone. He was later rejoined by the Lord Mayor. It was on September eighth that Manning began his second act of mediation. The men wanted the date to be the first of October. November fourth was offered to them as a compromise. At this point one of the representatives of the men, Toomey by name, suggested that the Cardinal meet the United Strike Committees in Poplar at Kirby Street Schools. Manning recorded that day as the date of his third act of mediation. He was to achieve a well-merited triumph.⁴³

He and Sydney Buxton went to Poplar where they met the various strike committees at "Wades' Arms." Two hours passed in fruitless debate, the men obstinately closing their ears to Manning's plea to bring the strike to an end by accepting November fourth. Nevertheless he went on, touching their hearts by his eloquent plea to them not to prolong the sufferings of their wives and children. "Then," writes Mr. Leslie, "he played his last card. He would call on the Irish Catholics in the Docks, and they would hear his voice." He was summoning the "sacred battalion" to fill in the breach. Thus he won the day. Tom McCarthy capitulated; and others followed. Manning describes his victory in these few words: "For two hours there was little hope. . . . Gradually a change came; and Mr. Champion moved a resolution adopting my proposal and empowering me to treat with the Directors. This was at last carried by twenty-eight to fifteen, nineteen Surrey men not voting, their demand being distinct from the north."⁴⁴

This was the beginning of the end. It was, of course, necessary to see the dock directors. They agreed to consider the terms if they came through Cardinal Manning, but the sympathy strike must be stopped. This was done and two days later—September

fourteenth—all parties signed the “Cardinal’s Peace” and the strike was formally ended. A week later, apropos of the difficulties of the peace, Manning wrote, “If the Directors a month ago had met their men face to face until they had come to agreement, the strike would have ended in ten days. Instead of this they tried to go round at the back of the men and fill their places with men from Greenock, Liverpool, and, it was said, from Antwerp. If they had succeeded we should have had bloodshed. Fifty thousand strangers at work and fifty thousand old hands out in the cold would have ended in an interminable conflict. Their failure in this has saved them. And then they call on us to rescue them from the dangers caused by their partial success in a blind policy.” The grateful workmen contributed their pennies toward a purse of £160 with which the Cardinal endowed a bed in the London Hospital.⁴⁵

The press was generous in its comment. Even the *Morning Post*, while characteristically finding it “impossible . . . to bestow unstinted commendation upon the outside interference” which marked the progress of the strike, stated that “none the less the mischief of a hasty public intervention had already done its worst before an informal arbitration was begun, and it is probable that Cardinal Manning and the Lord Mayor may justly credit themselves with having built the Dock Companies a golden bridge, and that at a time when they were in a remarkably tight place.” The *Times* reflected, “How much longer the strike might have dragged on but for the gallant efforts of Cardinal Manning, the Lord Mayor and Mr. Sydney Buxton, can only be conjectured.” The *Daily News* commented: “Of what Cardinal Manning has done it is superfluous to say much more. The country will not soon forget his services, and to the heart of every working man and woman in England his name will always be dear.” The *Pall Mall Gazette*, writing enthusiastically of the “Cardinal’s Peace,” concluded: “Other men have in this great struggle done excellently, but the Cardinal has excelled them all.” The *Daily Chronicle* likewise gave its meed of praise: “The result is due in a great measure to the individual efforts of Cardinal Manning, who has

laboured assiduously in spite of his eighty-one years, to effect a settlement on equitable terms. . . . The acceptance of the Compromise suggested by Cardinal Manning was a wise act on the part of both the Dock Committee and the Strikers."⁴⁶

Preceding the lengthy account of John Burns, Cardinal Manning contributed a brief note on the late strike to the October number of the *New Review*. Without allusion to his own part in its settlement, he reiterated the dangers inherent in such an industrial paralysis as that caused by the widespread strike. But good would come of it if it led to a registration of labourers and an organisation of labour. In this way the dock gates and the east end of the city would be freed from a menacing floating population of careless or desperate men. The writer concluded with a eulogy of the self-control which the men had shown throughout the trying days of the strike and a note of praise for the courteous bearing of the employers.⁴⁷

OTHER INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES

Manning lost no opportunity to raise his voice in denunciation of evil or to give a word of praise to men and agencies concerned in overcoming it with good. In August, 1884, the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society held a meeting at the Guildhall to celebrate its jubilee. The Prince of Wales presided, and Cardinal Manning delivered an eloquent and moving address. He expressed his regret at the unavoidable absence of Lord Shaftesbury, who, had he attended, would have been the only person present who had shared in the epoch-making legislation of 1833 whereby the evil of slavery had been put in process of extinction in western European civilisation. Manning admitted the difficulty and delicacy of the task involved in asking foreign governments to abolish slavery. Egypt, the very center of this trade, as well as the center of the Mohammedan world, was an exception. There, obligations to Britain were so numerous and her control so great that some urging on the part of the English would scarcely go unheeded. British cruisers which had long since cleared the west coast of Africa could do a like service for the eastern.

The Cardinal launched into a fervent excoriation of the horrors of the slave traffic, recalling the testimony of Dr. Livingstone, the mention of whose name called forth the cheers of the audience. Britain must bring this abomination to an end. She was bound to do so by virtue of her traditions of liberty and the principles of the great federation of her Christianity, because of the wrongs which she had in the past inflicted upon the negro race and in memory of her reparation, and, lastly, by the obligations of Empire entrusted to her, binding her to serve all peoples and all nations.⁴⁸

Manning was likewise interested in the movement of which Mr. Arnold White was the promoter, to encourage emigration to sparsely populated areas of the empire as a means of relieving the congestion of the great English towns. In May, 1886, he took part in a meeting of the National Association for Promoting State-directed Colonisation and there gave expression to his views. The government must, he claimed, undertake this task which was too gigantic for individuals or societies to assume. Colonisation was a solution of the food and population problem. But it meant more. In the new English-speaking groups which would spring up around the colonies as their nuclei lay the best security for peace. "Great empires, though powerful to destroy, are less warlike than a number of separate communities."⁴⁹

The editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Mr. Stead, threw himself into a campaign known as the Social Purity Crusade against the vicious conditions brought about by the prevalence of commercialised immorality, especially as it preyed upon the young. Manning, always eager to rescue the fallen and improve the moral tone of society, gave his support to the activities of Mr. Stead, writing to him, July 6, 1885, "I am reading your revelations with great horror, and will work with you with all my strength." Stead, like many well-intentioned reformers, seems to have been extreme and indiscreet, and, in consequence became involved with the law of England. Manning was present at the trial at which his protégé was convicted on a technicality, and wrote him a letter of encouragement and praise: ". . . You have now the crown

upon your work—that is to suffer for errors of judgment and a literal breach of the law which left the moral life of England almost without defence.” In after years, looking back over the event, he wrote, “In the uprising against the horrible depravity which destroys young girls, multitudes of ours, I was literally denounced by Catholics—not one came forward. If it was ill done, why did nobody try to mend it?” At the time of the agitation he had written to the editor of the *Tablet* who had expressed disapproval of Manning’s expressed intention to issue a Pastoral on the subject: “Twelve tribes of Pharisees and Scribes would not hinder me. What do they take me for? And what do they imagine themselves to be?”

The Cardinal knew his own mind; and this episode, deplored by many, showed that he had the moral courage to fight a lonely battle in an unpopular cause. He rejoiced that all was not without result. Writing to Canon Franklin, he said—“I had plenty to do when I supported Mr. Stead. But we amended our miserably defective criminal law.”⁵⁰

Manning, compassionate of all suffering, did not omit the lower animals from the scope of his sympathy. When the Victoria St. and International Society for the Total Suppression of Vivisection was founded he was made one of its Vice-Presidents, and took a keen interest in the work, giving it public support and frequently attending the meetings of the executive committee. In March, 1876, he joined a deputation to the Home Office to urge a Government bill to restrict vivisection. Such a bill was introduced and, with many changes, became the Act 39 & 40 Vict. c 77. Another example of his interest was shown by a speech which he made at the annual meeting of the society in June, 1881, in which, with harrowing details, he denounced vivisection as not only merciless and inhumane but of doubtful benefit to science. In support of this latter contention he invoked the testimony of the late Sir William Ferguson and Sir Charles Bell. As the practice seemed not to be susceptible of adequate restriction, he called upon the government to do away with it entirely.⁵¹

RELATIONS WITH OTHER SOCIAL REFORMERS

It was inevitable that Cardinal Manning's ideas and activities as a social reformer should influence other thinkers and doers in the same broad field of human achievement and that he in turn should react to them. This was true not only of the Catholics with whom he came in contact through the written or spoken word or by association in some common endeavour, but of the non-Catholics as well. While consistently uncompromising in matters of doctrine, he recognised that all the virtue and all the intelligence of the world are by no means monopolised by the faithful, but that "the spirit bloweth where it listeth." He was, therefore, ready to praise and eager to aid the good works of those with whose faith or lack of faith he could have little or no sympathy.

A word may be said first of this latter class. Mr. Leslie tells us that with the Christian Socialist, Maurice, Manning was "always on respectful terms, though he considered him 'an Ishmaelitish spirit' and Maurice in turn thought him too 'circular' in his views." A casual glance at the preceding pages of these chapters will reveal the names of other non-Catholics, Arch, Lord Salisbury, Burns, amongst others, whose ideas and activities touched a sympathetic chord in the Cardinal's heart. He and Sir Wilfred Lawson, for example, were probably the most conspicuous leaders of the temperance movement of their day and country.⁵²

In 1852, Manning received the following message from Florence Nightingale, whom Leslie calls Manning's "watcher in the slums":

"The intelligence of the working classes has almost without an exception gone over to the side of atheism. . . . The Wesleyans have no chance with them. Generally speaking those who are reclaimed from atheism are reclaimed by science—he [Kingsley] and Maurice are very popular among them—It is said that only those who do not wish to believe in God are atheists. This, I am sure, is not true. Men have said to me, 'I wish sore there was a God.'"

Manning had been one of the few to encourage Miss Nightingale

in the life's work she had chosen, and a letter of hers in 1852 tells how together they rescued a girl of fourteen. When news came of the conditions at the front during the Crimean War, Manning made this suggestion to Miss Stanley: "I have written to the Bishop of Southwark to see if any Sisters can be found for the East. Why will not Florence Nightingale give herself to this work?" When she was accepted by the War Office he sent her a letter of prayerful encouragement just before she left England for the East.⁵³

The Cardinal's comment on the "Life of Shaftesbury" is indicative of his high regard for that philanthropic statesman. In a note written on December 29, 1884, he said he had just finished reading Lord Shaftesbury's biography and then paid a glowing tribute to him and his work: "He took human suffering and human sorrow and the helplessness of childhood and of the poor as the end for which to live. He spent and was spent for it and his own life was a suffering life like the Man of Sorrows, going about doing good." And this of the man who had written in his diary in the spring of 1851: "Archdeacon Manning has joined the Church of Rome, and four clergymen in Leeds have done the same. Lord, purge the Church of those men, who, while their hearts are in the Vatican, still eat the bread of the Establishment and undermine her!" Manning seems not to have borne a grudge.⁵⁴

On more than one occasion, Manning expressed his sympathy for the leaders of the Salvation Army. Referring to them in an article in the *Contemporary Review* in 1882, he wished eternal rewards "to those who spend their lives in the salvation of souls." In regard to Huxley's attacks on Booth, Manning declared that he had no patience to read Professor Huxley's letters. In a letter thanking Booth for a copy of his book, *Darkest England*, Manning wrote that the author's comments on modern political economy, poor law administration, government statistics, and official inquiries coincided precisely with his own views on those subjects. Considering Booth's work from the humanitarian, not the religious standpoint, Manning in an article contributed to the

Paternoster Review, after stating that all the agencies then at work in London, however numerous and excellent, were inadequate to cover the wide field of misery and crime existing there, declared that "General Booth has at his command a vast organisation of devoted men and women ready to go and wade in the midst of this dead sea of human suffering. . . . If General Booth can reclaim this no man's land where the name of God is unknown, we will wish him in reward the fulness of all grace and truth." And when some, marveling at his words, expressed their surprise, he replied, "What would you have? In a desert where the shepherd is absent every voice which dispenses a portion of the truth prepares for the coming of Him who *is* the Truth." ⁵⁵

The casual reader of English history would not at once associate the name of Queen Victoria with social reform; but the Cardinal saw in her a Sovereign under whose aegis much progress had been made. In a speech which he delivered at Westminster Town Hall in February, 1887, at a meeting to further the foundation of an Imperial Institute to commemorate the jubilee of the Queen, Manning paid a gracious tribute to her Majesty. He eulogised her reign as one in which the liberties of the people had been extended:

"[There has never been] a period in which the condition of those working in the darkness of collieries and factories, of those degraded in brickfields or suffocated in chimneys, of the lowest and most suffering of our people has been so watchfully tended and so mercifully cared for. . . . If it had been possible to write hereafter in history that Queen Victoria had found the working classes of her people living in hovels and had left them living in homes, that would have been a noble jubilee memorial." It would, however, have been local, whereas The Imperial Institute, world-wide in its appeal, would be the center of the truest form of federation. ⁵⁶

One of the numerous reformers and agitators who called at Archbishop's House, Westminster, was Mr. Henry George, the famous American advocate of the single tax. The meeting between Manning and George is described by Mr. Meynell, who

accompanied the latter: "They had travelled to the same goal from opposite directions. 'I loved the people,' said Henry George, 'and that love brought me to Christ as their best friend and teacher.' 'And I,' said the Cardinal, 'loved Christ, and so learned to love the people for whom He died.' They faced each other in silence for a moment, a silence more moving than words." At the very beginning of the conversation, Manning expressed his belief that the law of property was rooted in nature and had been given supernatural sanction, and he told his visitor that unless they were in agreement on that, which lay at the foundation of society, they could not approach each other. Manning understood Mr. George to agree to this in principle and to be concerned only with the crying abuses of the natural right in question. The Cardinal afterwards, in a communication to the *Times*, expressed his pleasure at the earnestness and calmness of his guest. While Manning, though a staunch advocate of land reform, would never have approved of its nationalisation, he was undoubtedly convinced of both the sincerity of Mr. George and of the reality of the evils against which his voice was raised.

This favourable impression was to have its repercussion on the other side of the Atlantic when a deplorable incident, which can be told here only in the briefest possible way, occurred in the diocese of New York. Henry George, nominated for mayor of New York City in 1886, was supported in his campaign by a very popular New York priest, Dr. McGlynn. The Archbishop of New York, Dr. Corrigan, was not in town at the time, but a meddlesome business man with Tammany affiliations, apprised his vicar-general, Monsignor Preston, of Dr. McGlynn's activities and asked if the Catholic Church sanctioned the teachings of Mr. Henry George. Monsignor Preston, an inflexible convert of Yankee stock, forbade Dr. McGlynn to attend a meeting in support of Mr. George. Archbishop Corrigan on his return upheld the action of his representative, but Dr. McGlynn, beloved of the poor and encouraged by popular clamour, refused to obey. Then arose an unfortunate conflict between the Archbishop and the recalcitrant priest, of a nature to well-nigh throw the diocese of New

York into schism, leaving echoes which, though now faintly heard, have been prolonged to the present day.

This episode in American Church history has been introduced into our story only because during the mayoralty campaign in which Mr. George was defeated by Mr. Hewitt, the patronage of Manning had been introduced as a bait to catch the Catholic vote. Archbishop Corrigan, harassed by the strife in his diocese and puzzled by the invocation of Manning's name, wrote on November 30, 1886, to his colleague in England, apropos of the recent campaign:

"... Dr. McGlynn ventured to quote your Eminence saying as reported, 'And I may quote Cardinal Manning. Surely it will be admitted that he is an authority on doctrine and discipline. Cardinal Manning informed Mr. George that he saw nothing in his views to condemn, and when Mr. George stated that others had condemned them as being morally and theologically wrong, the Cardinal remarked that they were unauthorised critics.' Mr. George made a similar remark to me, but I paid no attention to it, presuming that he had misunderstood your Eminence. . . . A line from your Eminence," he concluded, "would be very opportune."

But the editor of the *World* was the first to secure the Cardinal's opinion by cabling across the Atlantic the question, "Do you apprehend that the Labour Movement led by Mr. George will extend to dangerous proportions?" Manning, equally unwilling, it would seem, to embarrass Corrigan or to forsake George, sent back his answer:

"I do not as far as England is concerned. The strongest desire of the working-man is to possess a house and garden of his own. When Mr. George was here it was the working-men in the towns who were chiefly attracted to him. . . ." Nevertheless, Manning sought advice from Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, who made a study of economic problems. Walsh said that he approved of the nationalisation of land in Ireland, but in Michael Davitt's way, not after the manner of Henry George. He explained the difference. Davitt believed in compensating the own-

ers for land taken by the State. George did not favour such compensation.

As to the outcome of the McGlynn case, the latter, who had been excommunicated, was reinstated in New York after he had given assurance to the Holy See that he did not repudiate the right of private property. This decision in no way implied a rebuke to Archbishop Corrigan, who during his days of sore trial had been actuated by zeal for what he believed to be the best interests of the Church, a fact which the papacy came fully to recognise and to appreciate. The decision did indicate, however, that the spirit of industrial democracy had found its way into the very citadel of Christendom, and of this new spirit a stubborn popular New York priest had been the far-off exemplar.

On still another occasion Manning was consulted by an American prelate about a matter pertaining to Mr. Henry George. This time it was Cardinal Gibbons who, cognisant of efforts being made in certain quarters to have Mr. George's book, *Progress and Poverty*, placed on the Index, appealed in 1888 to Manning, who was a member of that Congregation, to prevent this being done. He gave as reasons, that such blacklisting would only revive an interest in a book almost forgotten, that the author was no longer active in politics and that a condemnation would make a martyr of him. As to the errors in the book, theologians had already refuted them. He added as his opinion that, of the American episcopate, only a few, not a half-dozen, would fail to deplore a condemnation. The appeal was not in vain. Cardinal Manning assured Cardinal Gibbons that there was no danger that the book would be placed on the Index. Thus the incident was closed.⁵⁷

When seeking Manning's support, Gibbons had said, "Your Eminence's knightly help to me last year prompts me to call on you again." This recalls to mind another story in the annals of social reform which linked two worlds and brought together two enlightened princes of the Church in common zeal for a worthy cause. There arose in the nineteenth century in the United States an organisation known as the Knights of Labour which aimed to unite the skilled and the unskilled in one synthetic labour union

with centralised machinery and widely ramifying activities. It was destined to smash on the two rocks of racial disunion and personal ambition. The earlier class of immigrants, by that time well acclimated to their new environment, looked with disdain upon the later group who frequently differed from them in race, creed and nationality and were, therefore, not hailed as comrades in a common endeavour, nor did the new arrivals prove promising material for such amalgamation. That too was the period of rapid economic development when transitions from class to class were made with singular ease, and the labourer of one day might be the "boss" of the next—so why worry over means to improve the conditions of a state of life which might be ephemeral, at most a step to higher things? However, at the period with which we are concerned, these germs of disorganisation had not yet begun to fructify and to the average onlooker the Knights of Labour seemed formidable indeed. It was, moreover, a secret society, and it was this fact especially which made some Catholic observers uneasy, although the apparent extreme and Socialistic tendencies of the union likewise caused alarm.

Cardinal Gibbons espoused the cause of the Knights of Labour while the more shortsighted and timorous of his episcopal brethren carried complaints and charges to Rome. Manning upheld the position of Gibbons in the argument which ensued. The Knights fell under the ban of the Canadian hierarchy at whose head was Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec. The question was, would the Church in the United States follow this example? Cardinal Gibbons summoned Powderly, the head of the Knights, to consult with him; and then, after conferring with President Cleveland, communicated by letter with Cardinal Manning. The upshot of it all was that Gibbons, supported by ten of the twelve American archbishops, refused to adopt the Canadian policy.

But events had moved with great rapidity. Condemnation of the order had already been prepared at Rome; so with the odds against them, Gibbons and two of his faithful allies in the hierarchy set sail for the eternal city. Manning came to the rescue, fighting in the open for his American colleague, whose famous

letter to Cardinal Simeoni in defense of his position had left him unequivocally on the side of the forces whose condemnation was impending. Gibbons expressed his gratitude: "We are indebted more than you are aware to the influence of your name in discussing these social questions and in influencing the public mind. We joyfully adopt your Eminence into the ranks of our Knighthood. You have nobly won your spurs."

The cause of labour was triumphant at Rome and Gibbons stopped off at London on his return trip to America to see Manning and receive his congratulations. "Both," writes Mr. Leslie, "had played lonely and difficult parts in laying the foundation of the Church of the future under the crossfire of both the reactionary and the revolutionary." And, we may add, both had earned the lasting gratitude of the free and far-seeing spirits of their great countries, and of the working men and women of the world whose rights and interests transcend the bounds of nationhood.⁵⁸

Manning admired the great social reformers of the Continent, Frederic Ozanam, for instance, and Count de Mun. Of Cardinal Lavigerie, Archbishop of Carthage, he said, "He and I live out in the desert; for we are neither of us hampered by local traditions. He can support the Republic, and I can attack the capitalists. It is a mad world, and very sick."⁵⁹

Still more interesting is the resemblance of Manning's ideas to the views on the labour question held and promulgated by Pope Leo XIII. "Our Holy Father the Pope," said the Bishop of Newport the day that the Cardinal was buried, "loved him, and leaned upon him. I have heard him speak with his own lips of the wise advice and useful information he received from the Cardinal Archbishop." We have no reason to believe that this information and advice was restricted to purely ecclesiastical matters.

The Pontiff in January, 1891, in a personal letter to Manning told him that he was engaged in a consideration of the condition of working-men, which, he indicated, was a matter of concern to Manning. Two months later Dr. Walsh, then in Rome, informed the Cardinal that he and Manning had been selected by the Pope

to direct the English translation of the Encyclical, and said, "I think I can trace your Eminence's influence in this as in many other things that I have noted here during this visit."

In a letter to the Congress of Liège, the preceding year, Manning had expressed views which were strikingly reflected in the letter of the Pope. Both, for example, placed human dignity above the exigencies of business, both declared for a shortening of the hours of labour and both upheld the right of workmen to unite for mutual protection and support. Certainly Manning's comment on the Encyclical reveals how much in agreement were these two great ecclesiastics on matters affecting social well-being. Ben Tillett wrote an enthusiastic letter to the Cardinal in praise of the Encyclical. He naturally disliked the strictures on Socialism, but he regarded this as a minor matter, and added, "I hardly think our Protestant prelates would dare utter such wholesome doctrine." ⁶⁰

THE LAST PHASE

When, toward the end of his life, Cardinal Manning, to use his own expression, was "slowing into the station," he no longer took the active part in social reform which had marked the preceding years, but wrote articles on social and economic subjects for the chief periodicals of the day, and kept open house for all the reformers, agitators, prophets and cranks who flocked to his great cold mansion, confident of a sympathetic audience with the aged prelate. One group only failed to receive a hearty welcome—the advocates of woman's rights. He was convinced that the extension of the suffrage to women would have been a salutary curb to the progress of the liquor traffic which he abhorred, and he knew from history and personal observation of the administrative capacity of great numbers of women; but he shrank from advocating the participation of women "en masse" in the political life of the nation. Such activities seemed to him unsuited to women as a whole and likely to be destructive of their unique character and contribution to society. Whether one regards his attitude on this point as the expression of a prejudice or of a principle will

depend on whether one reacts with favour or disfavour to the woman's movement.⁶¹

When the Catholics and the workers came to Manning in 1890, on the occasion of his silver jubilee, to tender him their greetings and their thanks, the English Jews appeared one day with their testimonial of good will, presenting him with an address signed by Lord Mayor Isaacs, Rabbi Adler and Lord Rothschild. This was their way of expressing their gratitude for the times when he had lifted up his voice in their behalf. Ten years before, Manning had moved the resolution at the Mansion House in protest against the massacres in Russia, and had likewise defended the Jews against the absurd charge of ritual murder. In a letter to Sir John Simon, December 8, 1890, he wrote of them as "a race with a sacred history of nearly four thousand years; at present without a parallel, dispersed in all lands, with an imperishable personal identity, isolated and changeless, greatly afflicted, without home or fatherland; visibly reserved for a future of signal mercy."

And after his death, the Jews in a New York synagogue were urged to "Remember his name as a blessing."⁶²

On January 14, 1892, he died. His fellow-Catholics mourned him as an ecclesiastic who had been a stalwart defender of the faith; his countrymen were bereaved at the passing of a distinguished Englishman who had loved and served his country; but, above all, the poor and the lowly sorrowed because they had lost in him a fearless champion and a devoted friend. In the tributes paid by the press to his memory repeated reference was made to his career as a social reformer; and those who had least liked his religious policies joined with his staunchest supporters in praise of his practical Christian charity and humanitarian services. The loss felt in labour circles was expressed as union after union met and passed resolutions of regret. A compositor, Mr. Bateman, said that "English, Irish and Italian workers in London felt that by the death of Cardinal Manning they had lost their best friend." Not many months before, the *Tablet* had written of Manning that "No good cause from Imperial Federation to Express Postage ever

appealed to him in vain." We are reminded of those words when we read that at his death the *British Medical Journal* remembered him "as a friend of active hygiene and social and sanitary progress." Truly, he omitted few worthy causes from his category of good works.

The London *Times* was of the opinion that Manning had for years exercised an influence in English life such as had been possessed by no Catholic ecclesiastic since the Reformation. Some years afterwards, Cardinal Gibbons compared him to a great figure in mediæval history, Cardinal Stephen Langton, who, like him, had fought for the liberty of the people.

On January 21, Manning's funeral took place at the Brompton Oratory, the Bishop of Newport delivering the Panegyric. Great numbers of labour organisations were represented, and working-men by the hundred thousand lined the three miles of road from the chapel to the cemetery. Achille Lemire, the brother of the author of *Le cardinal Manning et son action sociale*, visited the tomb of the Cardinal at Kensal Green a short time afterward. In a letter, he told how in the enclosure at the foot of the cross he found a visiting card from which the rain had washed all but these words

"To our . . .

from his poor children." In another part of the tomb he saw a sort of plate on which, too, the rain had fallen, leaving the inscription,

"From St. Alphonsus' League of the Cross, Glasgow."⁶⁸

The memory of Cardinal Manning's work as a social reformer will survive the years as these two characteristic tributes had defied the ravages of wind and storm.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Thureau-Dangin, P., *English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century* 2 vols. (London, 1914), Vol. ii, pp. 182, 183; Hutton, A. W., *Cardinal Manning* (London, 1892), p. 179.

² Lemire, J., *Le cardinal Manning et son action sociale* (Paris, 1894), has a thought-provoking treatment of the relationship between the Irish and the social question, pp. 101-103.

⁹ Leslie, S., *Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours* (London, 1921), p. 403.

⁴ Taylor, I. A., *The Cardinal Democrat, Henry Edward Manning* (London, 1908), pp. 119-140; Leslie, *op. cit.*, Ch. xx; *Times*, May 5, 1886.

⁵ Manning, *A Letter to Lord Grey*, March 12, 1868, published as one of a number of documents in a collection devoted to *Ireland: History*, pp. 2-44; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-123; Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 384.

⁶ Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 205, 206.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 382.

⁸ Purcell, E. S., *Life of Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster*, 2 vols. (London and New York, 1895), Vol. ii. p. 641, *Times*, July 11, 1881. For discussion of the Land Bill which was introduced into the House of Commons April 7, 1881, see *Hansard*, 3rd series Vol. cclx, pp. 890 *et seq.*

⁹ *Times*, July 20, 1881.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, March 22, 1883. Two years later, Manning came out in favour of Chamberlain's scheme for Irish local government with a central board. The political situation was complicated by projected bills for Irish Land Purchase and Coercion, respectively, and after a split in the Cabinet, the Government fell. Gwynn, S., and Tuckwell, G., *The Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M. P.*, 2 vols. (New York, 1917), Vol. ii, pp. 129-132.

¹¹ Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 426, 429. The Plan of Campaign was the formation of associations made up of tenants of a given locality. Each tenant was to offer to the landlord for his holding what was regarded by the association as a fair rent. If the sum were refused it was paid into a general fund to be used for the maintenance of evicted tenants. (Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 132, 134.)

¹² Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

¹³ Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 185, 186.

¹⁴ Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

¹⁵ *Archbishop Manning and the Permissive Bill* (Manchester, 1868).

¹⁶ Black Temperance Collection: *Archbishop Manning on the Permissive Bill* (Manchester, 1873); Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-106.

¹⁷ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 591-604; Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 84; *Tablet*, Apr. 27, 1878; *Times*, June 3, 1879, Aug. 22, 1883, Aug. 19, 1884, July 1, 1891. The Centenary of Cardinal Manning's birth was made the occasion of a great demonstration for the purpose of putting new life into the temperance movement. *Tablet*, July 25, 1908. In 1914, for the first time in history perhaps, a public-house in South London was converted into a temperance hall. It was dedicated to the memory of Cardinal Manning. *Ibid.*, Feb. 14, 1914.

¹⁸ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 165; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 98, 99.

¹⁹ *Tablet*, Jan. 16, 1892; *Times*, Mar. 25, 1874.

²⁰ *Times*, Aug. 24, 1875; *Ibid.*, Aug. 28, 1878; *Ibid.*, Dec. 19, 1876.

²¹ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 604.

²² *Dublin Review*, Vol. 14 (1885), p. 410.

²³ *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 46 (1886), pp. 388-394.

²⁴ *Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 23 (1888), pp. 321-330.

²⁵ *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 49 (1888), pp. 790-794.

²⁶ *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 57 (1890), pp. 769-773.

²⁷ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

²⁸ Russell, G. W. E. (editor), *Sir Wilfrid Lawson, A Memoir* (London, 1910), p. 381; Elliott, The Hon. A. D., *Life of Lord Goschen, 1831-1907* (London, 1911), Vol. ii, pp. 165-168. It is interesting to note that the Licensing Act of 1904, while it introduced the system of local option whereby the number of public houses should be reduced, also gave legal expression to the principle of compensation for publicans.

²⁹ *Times*, Jan. 22, 1892.

³⁰ *Tablet*, Jan. 23, 1892.

³¹ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 390, 391.

³² Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 195; Bodley, *op. cit.*, p. 24. The question of the precedence of Manning is discussed by Bodley in the text of his essay, pp. 4-6, and also in a note at the end of it, pp. 59-65; *Tablet*, Mar. 1, 1884.

³³ Bodley, J. E. C., *Cardinal Manning* (London and New York, 1912), p. 8; Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-138; Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1885, Vol. xxx (c-4402).

Sir Charles Dilke tells how the Cardinal handed him a list of suggestions, "which were not only revolutionary, but ill-considered, and I have to note how curiously impracticable a schemer, given to the wildest plans, this great ecclesiastic showed himself." He wanted removed from London not only the publicly controlled prisons and infirmaries but also breweries, ironworks, and all factories not needed for daily or home work, thus releasing these areas for housing the working class. This was certainly zoning with a vengeance! Gwynn, S., and Tuckwell, G., *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 19. Manning had written in a letter to Dilke in 1883: "Without a high-handed executive nothing will be done till another generation has been morally destroyed, but construction must keep pace with destruction—I am impatient at political conflicts while these social plagues are destroying our people." *Ibid.*, Vol. i, pp. 508, 509.

³⁴ Alden, P., *Democratic England* (New York, 1912), pp. 167, 168; Alden, P. and Hayward, E., *Housing* (London, 1910), p. 16; Hayes, C. J. H., *Social Politics* (New York, 1913), pp. 291-314, esp. p. 292.

³⁵ *Nineteenth Century*, Vol. 23 (1888), pp. 321-330.

³⁶ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 196; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 639.

³⁷ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 656.

³⁸ Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 369; Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 392; Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-106.

³⁹ Lemire, *op. cit.*, p. 108; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

⁴⁰ Smith, H. L., and Nash, V., *The Story of the Dockers' Strike* (London, 1889), pp. 13-125; see also Purcell, Leslie, Lemire, Hutton, Taylor; *Dublin Review*, Vol. 109 (1891), p. 164.

⁴¹ Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 370; De Pressensé, F., *Cardinal Manning* (Philadelphia, 1897), p. 214. Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

⁴² Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 371; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 204, 206.

⁴³ Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 207; Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

⁴⁴ Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 215-216; Leslie, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

⁴⁵ Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 372-4; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-219; Smith and Nash, *op. cit.*, to end; *Tablet*, Jan. 18, 1890.

⁴⁶ *Tablet*, Sept. 21, 1889; *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 56 (1889), p. 745.

⁴⁷ *New Review*, Vol. i (1889), pp. 410-411. Burns likewise drew a two-fold lesson from the strike: (1) The need for all sections of labour to organise themselves and (2) The fact that workmen if resolutely combined were fully capable of meeting the forces of capitalism. *Ibid.*, pp. 412-422; *La réforme sociale*, Vol. viii (1889), pp. 603-609.

⁴⁸ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 642; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-200; *Tablet*, Aug. 9, 1884; *Ibid.*, Feb. 3, 1923.

⁴⁹ Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-198.

⁵⁰ Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 459-461; Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 391; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 653-655; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-245; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-159; *Pall Mall Gazette*, July 16, 1885; *Ibid.*, July 27, 1885. "In 1881," wrote Manning, "a Commission took evidence and reported on the immoralities of London, and especially on the traffic in young girls between London and the Continent. The revelations of that report fall little short of the revelations of the 'Pall Mall Gazette.' But a Blue-book is read by few. . . . By our present legal code a girl cannot give her consent to marriage before the age of twenty-one, but she is regarded as capable of consenting to her own ruin at the age of thirteen years . . . the immense pressure brought to bear upon the Government has compelled it to promise that the Criminal Law Amendment Bill shall pass into the statute book before Parliament is prorogued." *Ibid.*, Oct. 1, 1885. The result of the agitation was the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885.

George Bernard Shaw once said of Stead that "his indignations did him credit." A sympathetic account of Manning's relations with Stead in their common indignation against the white slave traffic is to be found in Whyte, F., *Life of W. T. Stead*, 2 vols. (London, 1925), Vol. i, pp. 160, 165, 183, 197, 215, 278-80.

⁵¹ Publications of the Victoria Street Society for the Protection of Animals from Vivisection—(1) *Cardinal Manning as an Anti-Vivisectionist* (speech at annual meeting in June, 1881); (2) *The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster on Vivisection* (London, 1887?).

⁵² *Dublin Review*, Vol. 165 (1919), p. 1; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 638; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 216. Broadhurst, H., *From a Stoneman's Bench to the Treasury Bench* (London, 1901), pp. 299-300.

⁵³ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 165 (1919), p. 2; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-109, Cook, E. F., *Florence Nightingale* (London, 1913), pp. 160, 161.

⁵⁴ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 678; Hodder, E., *Life and Work of Shaftesbury*, 2 vols. (London, 1886-7), Vol. ii, p. 338; Bready, J. W., *Lord Shaftesbury and Social Industrial Progress* (London, 1926?), pp. 14, 413.

⁵⁵ Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 391-2; Begbie, H., *Life of General William Booth* (New York, 1920), Vol. ii, p. 118. *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 42 (1882); *Tablet*, Jan. 3, 1891.

⁵⁶ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

⁵⁷ Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 353-356. *Dublin Review*, Vol. 165 (1919), pp. 8-10; Will, A. S., *Life of Cardinal Gibbons*, 2 vols. (New York, 1922?), Vol. i, pp. 361-378.

⁵⁸ Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 650, 651; Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 391; *Dublin Review*, Vol. 165 (1919), pp. 13-19; *Ibid.*, Jan. 1917; Gibbons, J., *Retrospect of Fifty Years* (Baltimore, 1916), p. 190; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 364-365; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 203; Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-360; *Dublin Review*, Vol. 160 (1917), p. 171; *Tablet*, May 20, 1887.

⁵⁹ Manning, *Miscellanies* (London, 1877), Vol. ii, pp. 386, 390; Bodley, *op. cit.*, p. 14. Extant letters reveal the deep respect in which de Mun held Manning. The July, 1891, number of *Merry England* contains letters on the social question written from Manning to M. Decurtins, the Bishop-President of the Congress of Liège, and the Editor of the *XXième Siècle*, giving expression to hope for legislation for the protection of the working classes and prophetic of the spread of the democratic movement.

⁶⁰ De Pressensé, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-198; Hutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 246, 247; *Tablet*, Jan. 23, 1892; Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 158-162; Lunn, A. H. M., *Roman Converts* (London, 1924), p. 121; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 378-381; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-194.

⁶¹ Manning, H. E., *Four Great Evils of the Day* (New York, 1899), pp. 55, 56.

⁶² Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, p. 653; Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 246; Leslie, *op. cit.*, pp. 485-486; Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 237, 238, 249, 250; Purcell, *op. cit.*, Vol. ii, pp. 485, 486.

⁶³ De Pressensé, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-220; Lemire, *op. cit.*, pp. 98, 276-282; *Tablet*, Jan. 23, 1892. *Ibid.*, Feb. 14, 1892, Feb. 20, 1892. *Times*, Jan. 15, 1892. *Ibid.*, Jan. 22, 1892. Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 214; Belloc, B. R., *In a Walled Garden* (New York, 1895), pp. 220-221; *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. 17 (1892), pp. 356-368; *Nouvelle Revue*, Vol. 74 (1892), p. 611 *et seq.* Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, pp. 423, 424; *New York Times*, Jan. 15, 1892; *Dublin Review*, Vol. 110 (1892), pp. 372, 379; *Review of Reviews* (English), Vol. 5 (1892), pp. 129-135; *Catholic World*, Vol. 54 (1891-92), pp. 633-643; *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. 17 (1892), pp. 356-368; *La Revue Générale*, Vol. 55 (1892), pp. 725-741; *Contemporary Review*, Vol. 61 (1892), pp. 172-184, pp. 188-193.

CHAPTER III

ECONOMIC THEORIES AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS

In one sense there is no Catholic school of political economy, in the sense, namely, that there is no Catholic school of mathematics or physics. The binomial theorem is not the expression of an irreligious principle, and belief in the laws of motion cannot be regarded as subversive of morality. Similarly, Gresham's conclusion as to the relative elusiveness of good and bad money offers no challenge to the devout mind.

But the human element enters into economics. It is man who produces, distributes and consumes the goods which make up the wealth of the world. According to Catholic teaching, he may, in carrying on these activities, act ethically—in harmony with nature and religion—or, defying both, run afoul of the moral law. The account of the social action of Cardinal Manning has given us numerous illustrations of theory and practice in this regard. The present chapter will approach the subject from another angle and attempt to set forth the relations of Catholics in England to those organised movements of their fellow citizens which are based on distinctive social and economic theories and frequently take on some political expression. There may exist the greatest diversity among Catholics in their attitude toward some of these movements. But the principles behind others are such that Catholics cannot consistently adhere to them. Consideration will first be given to the relations between British Catholics and the various phases of the Socialist Movement.

SOCIALISM

Socialism is a hydra-headed ideal, meaning widely different things to different people, and it has changed its aims and aspects

throughout its eventful history. "Socialism," writes Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, one of its English exponents, "is a tendency, not a revealed dogma, and therefore it is modified in its forms of expression from generation to generation."¹ Hence arises the difficulty of formulating a definition of Socialism acceptable to all who profess that economic philosophy or who stand in opposition to it. Two may be appropriately drawn from sources pertinent to our theme. Macdonald defines Socialism as "the creed of those who, recognising that the community exists for the improvement of the individual and for the maintenance of liberty, and that the control of the economic circumstances of life means the control of life itself, seek to build up a social organisation which will include in its activities the management of those economic instruments such as land and industrial capital that cannot be left safely in the hands of individuals."²

The leaders of the Catholic Church have not as a rule denounced Socialism in this sense, but since they have offered a continuous opposition to the more orthodox brands, and we shall be concerned with their attitude toward Socialism of all types in England, a definition of Socialism from a Catholic source will not be out of place: [Socialism is] "A system of social and economic organisation that would substitute state monopoly for private ownership of the sources of production and means of distribution, and would concentrate under the control of the secular governing authority the chief activities of life."³

Whatever embellishments might be put on these and the numerous other definitions that could be quoted, they would, if accurate, contain the essence of Socialistic thought—namely, that human welfare would best be served if public ownership of the means of production were substituted for the present system of private control.

The history of the movement, however, reveals a confusing fluctuation of concept. Some devotees of a new economic order have so far fled reality as to envisage a state of society free from poverty where universal happiness should reign. "Utopians" we call these dreamers of dreams. Of such stuff was made Plato's

Republic, and—about two millenniums later—the *Utopia* of More. In recent times the more fanciful of the Socialists, tearing a leaf from the books of these thinkers, have advocated pleasant impractical schemes. Fourier's "phalanxes" were tried out at Brook Farm and Owen's coöperative ideas inspired the colony at New Harmony, Indiana. Neither experiment was crowned with success.

With this type of Socialism we are little concerned. Marxian Socialism, both in its origins and in its influence, bears a closer relation to the early movement in Great Britain. Marx looked for the fulfillment of the Socialist ideal as the catastrophic outcome of the Industrial Revolution and the unprecedented cleavage in human society to which it gave rise. History was to him the story of class conflicts. From the beginning man's hand had been raised against his brother, and the struggle had gone on between the exploiter and his victim. Master and slave, patrician and plebeian, manorial lord and serf—the dreary tale of the opposition of the one to the other made up the story of the centuries. Each succeeding age brought its own peculiar conflict between oppressor and oppressed. From the time of the Industrial Revolution the bourgeoisie had been pitted against the proletariat. Only now the inevitable triumph of Socialism seemed nearer, aided as it was by the growing acuteness of class antagonisms and the suicidal nature of capitalistic development. Marx's revolutionary Socialism set up labour as the sole source of wealth and as such entitled to the whole product. He logically regarded landlords and capitalists as predatory superfluities who reaped where they had not sown.⁴ The central tenet of modern proletarian Socialism, namely, the right of the worker to the whole product of his labour, is deeply rooted in the early history of English working class thought. And to that thought, it has been plausibly maintained, Marx was deeply indebted.⁵

Not many years after the death of Marx, Dr. Anton Menger, who was professor of jurisprudence in the University of Vienna, published a book, *Das Recht auf den Vollen Arbeitsertrag in Geschichtlicher Darstellung*, in which he traced the origin and development of the doctrine that labour has the right to the whole

product of industry. In 1899, this work was translated into English. Professor Foxwell of the department of economics, University College, London, who wrote the introduction, accepted the conclusion of the author that the revolutionary reaction against capitalism was English in its inspiration. In the writings of the English School of Godwin, Hall, Thompson, Gray, Hodgskin and Bray, Dr. Menger found the genesis of Marxian Socialism. "Marx," he wrote, "is completely under the influence of the earlier English Socialists, and more particularly of William Thompson." ⁶

But the ultimate evolution of Socialism in England was not to be along the lines laid down by Marx. Even on the Continent pure Marxism was subject to numerous modifications by the Revisionist Movement which was begun by Bernstein in 1899. Economic determinism and class warfare came to figure less and less in Socialistic literature. The possibilities of constitutional methods became increasingly appealing. Only extremist elements like the Communists seemed committed to the inevitability of revolution. Syndicalists continued to believe in the organisation of labour on the basis of the class struggle, and, like the Communists, despaired of the power of political action against the evils of Capitalism.

In England, however, the influence of Marxian Socialism was destined to be even less than elsewhere in Europe. From the period of the Chartist Movement it appreciably declined; and so obscured were its English origins that it was received as an exotic philosophy when it made its reappearance in the "eighties." It was never, indeed, to get a very strong hold upon the English people as a whole, although it exerted an influence on certain groups. The Social Democratic Federation which began in 1881 was organised along Marxian lines. In 1893 arose the Independent Labour Party under the leadership of Keir Hardie, for the purpose of making Socialism a political issue. Its conciliatory policy left the S. D. F. probably the only genuine representative of orthodox Socialism in England. The Fabian Society, largely recruited from middle-class intellectuals, is Socialistic in its aims, but it pins its hopes on education, not catastrophe. The Socialist

contingent of the British Labour party while sufficiently numerous to worry some conservative Catholics is of sufficiently pale hue to evoke the jeers of that not over polite left-wing Marxian, Mr. Leon Trotsky, one-time Braunstein.⁷

Numerous quotations from the writings of representative English Socialists could be given to prove the conservative nature of their views, and to prove further that Socialists in England and Catholics there are not necessarily always to be found in opposing camps. Against the indubitably Marxian elements—not very numerous—Catholics present a united front. There is a philosophic antagonism not far to seek. The true Marxist explains all historical phenomena as brought about by economic conditions. The consciousness of man is similarly determined: his concepts are but a reflex of material entities. Needless to say such an explanation of human development makes no provision for the claims and the teachings of a revealed religion. The practical programme of Marxism likewise encounters disapproval amongst Catholics. The latter recognise no class interests that should be irreconcilable if Christian principles were followed, and they proclaim the expediency of the right to the possession of private property in general, whatever fault might legitimately be found with that bourgeois property which Marx specifically assailed.

The Marxian viewpoint has small influence on the course of the labour movement in Great Britain. Only a critic as deficient in knowledge as in humour could accuse Mr. Ramsay Macdonald of undermining Christian society. One could peruse Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain* and seek in vain for any plank in that platform which would be unacceptable to Catholics on religious or moral grounds.

To cap the climax, Leon Trotsky, who should know his brethren when he sees them, has devoted pages to ridiculing both the timidity and the religious affiliations of the English labour leaders. "How can they dare threaten bourgeois property, when they do not even dare refuse the Prince of Wales pocket money?—To

proclaim a Socialist platform and at the same time to declare that the royal power does not 'interfere' and is actually cheaper, is equivalent, for instance, to a recognition of materialistic science combined with the use of magic incantations for toothache—since the latter are cheaper—The characteristics of conservatism, religiosity, national conceit will be found in varying degrees in all the present-day official leaders from the extreme Right Thomas to the Left Kirkwood.”⁸

Another interesting reflection of the same writer is even more significant: “John Wheatley, former Minister for Health in MacDonald’s Cabinet, is regarded as almost extreme left. None the less, Wheatley is not only a Socialist, but also a Catholic. To put it more correctly, he is first of all a Catholic, and only afterwards a Socialist—To this ‘left-winger’ Socialist policy is directed by personal morality, and personal morality by religion.”⁹

More than a decade before Mr. Trotsky penned his ungracious words about those whom the undiscerning might call his English comrades, Archbishop Whiteside of Liverpool foresaw and rejoiced in the direction that Socialism was taking in Great Britain. Speaking at the National Catholic Congress in 1913 he mentioned that he had just been reading Philip Snowden’s book on *Socialism and Syndicalism*. He went on to say that Mr. Snowden advocated a new Socialism, and, if that were going to prevail, Catholics would be in a position to remain neutral in regard to it and no longer be inimical to its advocates. “In fact, I think we might almost grasp hands with them.”¹⁰

If the Marxian element in British Socialism is almost negligible and if the Socialistic movement in Great Britain is relatively free from irreligious tendencies, how are we to account for that recurring opposition to Socialism there which we shall shortly record? The literature of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain is replete with anti-Socialist tracts.

There are several possible explanations of this phenomenon. For one thing, the social and moral theories of certain professed Socialists among the litterati—Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells, for example,—are not such as to reassure Catholics that Socialism

even in Britain is free from what they regard as teachings offensive to the Christian social order. Then it may be felt that when Socialism of any sort is favoured, there is no guarantee that in a crisis it may not outrun the bounds set by the British temperament and impregnate the whole labour movement with radical ideas. There seems also to be a nervous fear that private property, which the Church holds to be morally lawful and socially useful, is never quite safe from attack even by Socialists of the palest hue.¹¹

More important than these considerations is the tradition against the movement. The word "Socialism" conveys an impression of heterodoxy, and—when connected with Catholics—of disloyalty, to the Catholic mind. Catholics are confronted by the undoubted fact that from time to time the leaders of the Church—popes and bishops—have seen fit to denounce Socialism and denounce it by name. It may be mentioned parenthetically that the antithesis of Socialism—Individualism—has likewise met with ecclesiastical reprobation, but implicitly. Exponents of Economic Liberalism have not been so incautious as to organise themselves into an international school of thought, to draw up an elaborate credo and to give themselves a label. Tactful candidates for public office do not shout from the hustings their undying devotion to invisible government. They are chary of promises to regenerate society on the basis of freedom of contract. They preach these things, but not directly, and thus their views escape explicit condemnation. With unblushing absence of self-consciousness, the Socialist proclaims his affiliations. He gives himself a name, a name from which the Catholic Church has steadfastly withheld its approval.

The reasons for the latter's antipathy are partially explicable in the light of history. Socialism in the early days of its eventful career presented a decidedly irreligious aspect and was, moreover, identified with certain revolutionary movements. It invited that ecclesiastical disapprobation which it was not slow in receiving. From Gaeta in 1848, the once liberal Pius IX, now swung to conservatism by the excesses of the Roman Revolution, hurled his

anathema at the movement which he held responsible not only for his own sad plight but for the tragic fate of his enlightened minister of state, the Count Pellegrino Rossi. A year later he reiterated this condemnation of Socialism and Communism. In the first year of his pontificate, Leo XIII issued his Encyclical *Concerning Modern Errors: Socialism, Communism, Nihilism*. He had in mind the disorders of 1877-8. In those days Socialism and Communism were used more or less interchangeably; and it was Communism rather than the milder brands of Socialism that the Pope condemned in 1891 in his *Rerum Novarum*.¹²

Instances could be multiplied to prove that Socialism has consistently met with ecclesiastical condemnation, papal and episcopal. Though this condemnation is only disciplinary, and lacking the elements necessary to give it "ex cathedra" force, it conveys the mind of the Church so definitely to its members that Catholics in England as in other parts of the world hesitate to call themselves Socialists even when attracted to some pastel shade of the philosophy which obviously does not fall under the ban. They have also added a not inconsiderable literature of invective against bona fide Socialism wherever it has manifested itself, their orthodoxy and zeal at times eclipsing those of the Pope. Be it said for the sound sense and moderation of English Catholics, however, that they have not been given as a rule to the erection of straw men as objects of their attacks. Nor have they in general been guilty of making gratuitous additions to the deposit of faith.¹³

Nevertheless, for the reasons stated, English Catholic writers on social topics have felt themselves called upon to denounce Socialism. Chief among these writers was the one outstanding English Catholic political economist, Charles Stanton Devas, whose contribution to the development of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain is of sufficient importance to warrant some consideration of his life and works by way of introduction to his views on Socialism.

CHARLES STANTON DEVAS

Devas was born in 1848 and was educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, where he took a first class in history and law. He was early converted to Catholicism, and in 1876 accepted the position of professor of political economy at the recently opened Catholic University College, Kensington. For nine years he was examiner in political economy to the Royal University of Ireland and was a frequent contributor to the *Dublin Review*, the *Economic Journal* and the *International Journal of Ethics*. He died in 1906.¹⁴

His more ambitious publications included *The Groundwork of Economics*, and akin to this, a smaller book, his *Political Economy*, one of the Stonyhurst series of manuals of philosophy; *Studies of Family Life*, an historical disquisition on the status of the family and the nature of family relationships among various peoples at different times in the world's history; and, *The Key to the World's Progress*. This last was meant as an introduction to historical study. The "key to open a hundred closed doors" was church history as world history, "the world record made intelligible by the Church record."¹⁵

On the occasion of his death, the *Economic Journal* in its appreciation noted that Devas was distinguished amongst those who had written on political economy by the fact that he considered the subject from the Catholic point of view. It borrowed the phrase from the pamphlet which he had written in 1876 and had entitled, *Labour and Capital from the Catholic Point of View*. The writer went on to praise the high moral tone of his economic teaching, and added that those who had participated with him in public examinations had observed his scrupulous anxiety to do justice to candidates whose opinions he abhorred.¹⁶

"Economics," wrote Devas in an article, "Lessons from Ruskin," which he had contributed to the same journal, "must be essentially ethical; the application of the moral law in particular departments of human life." Ruskin, he thought, had fulfilled

that ideal in his economic views. It was likewise the keystone of his own teaching. He argued for an economic science which should become patently and explicitly ethical. Self-interest alone would be sufficient to dictate the change, lest the "firm of political economy" find itself bankrupt as its customers flocked to examine the wares of the Socialist concern.¹⁷

Catholic sympathy, he held, should be with the workers in the manufacturing and mining industries in their efforts to improve their lot. On even stronger grounds were agricultural labourers and small proprietors entitled to this good will in their struggle against adverse fortune.¹⁸

On December 13, 1899, Devas read a paper before the Manchester Statistical Society on "The Statistical Aspect of Wealth and Welfare," which contained much sound advice to statisticians and sociologists on how *not* to use figures, lest the result be a distortion of the truth. "All those," he said, "who have seriously tried to obtain an accurate knowledge of social facts, to form a real estimate of the condition of different peoples at different times and places will have found out how difficult is the enquiry." There existed the gravest diversity of opinion not merely among untrained or reckless writers, but among serious students, the reason being the extreme difficulty of observation and reasoning in social matters whether regarding the present or the past.¹⁹

Scientific history, he went on to say, was in the closest connection with the higher statistics, namely, the accurate and methodical presentation of pertinent social facts. The document was the most indispensable of instruments. Since statistics included social dynamics, or changes in the social state, with their causes and their meanings, as well as social statics, social history and the science of statistics were, in the opinion of the speaker, scarcely to be distinguished from each other. The word, statistics, taken in the narrow sense of mere numerical data, could tell but little about national wealth, and still less about national welfare. There might be similarity in figures and total unlikeness in their significance. The higher statistics alone could furnish an accurate presentment of real conditions as a basis for comparison and

judgment. "Let the students of the abstract and the theoretical work in combination with the students of the concrete and the practical, and we shall soon have in social science and social reform something more than merely negative results." ²⁰

Devas, in common with other Catholic social thinkers, opposed Socialism. In his *Key to the World's Progress*, he took exception to the current indiscriminate use of the word "Socialism" to describe any effort to ameliorate social conditions. It should, he held, be confined to those theories "that have in common the wish to abolish, rather than amend inequality of service, and thus make an end of income from interest, rent and dividends." ²¹

He believed that to object to all economic legislation on behalf of the poor on the ground that it was Socialistic was an excellent way, not of discrediting, but of promoting Socialism: ". . . any one who is serious can quite well distinguish . . . the measures proposed of partial expropriation and of the intervention of authority to check abuses of private property, cruel extortion, and the degradation of the poor, from real socialism which confounds use and abuse, turns an exceptional remedy into the rule, and perversely aims at the absorption of private opulence and power by the State, instead of seeking to promote among the higher classes the right use of that opulence and that power." ²²

But he made no vulgar and unjust attack upon Socialism, nor did he underestimate its power over the minds and hearts of men. "To deal effectually with any widespread opinion we must treat it sympathetically, have felt its attraction, have distilled from it the soul of goodness which it contains, above all when we find ourselves in controversy with the spokesmen of poverty. . . . The arguments in favour of Socialism are much stronger than many of its opponents suppose." ²³

He disposed of what he called popular Anti-Socialism, such as the charge that the movement was immoral and irreligious, subversive of the family and the Church. To that charge it might be answered that "these doctrines, though taught by many Socialists, are taught with more virulence and less excuse by many others besides Socialists. . . ." "Again, if the Catholic workman is told

that Socialism is condemned by Leo XIII, he may be taught to reply that precisely private property is what is secured by scientific Socialism, and that it was not scientific Socialism which Leo XIII condemned, only the abuses of violence and communism, indeed, that by their efforts to universalise private property, to endow the present mill-hand and farm-hand and slum dweller with their own house and home, goods and garden, to put an end to usury, monopoly, and the ruthless warfare of rival traders, the Socialists are the true pupils of Leo XIII, and that his true opponents are the receivers—many, perhaps, unwittingly, but still the receivers—through the manifold channels of rent and interest, of profits flowing from sweated labour, from slum dwellings, from extortionate prices, from foul wares, from fouler drink-shops and houses of debauchery.”²⁴

Sound opposition to Socialism could be based on a consideration of its unhistorical nature. Man is represented by Socialism in a way that does not appear in history. The records of authentic history reveal that in all civilised societies there existed the double feature of service and inheritance: land and other sources of permanent income were privately owned and passed on from generation to generation, and the vast majority of men worked for others. Mankind throughout the ages has given no evidence of certain steady improvement, but has manifested a downward and backward tendency as well as an upward and forward one. In the opinion of Devas, the anti-national character of Socialism likewise stamped it as unreal and unhistorical.²⁵

On February 20, 1906, not many months before his death, he delivered a lecture for the Catholic Truth Society of Scotland entitled “Plain Words on Socialism.” Again he emphasised the necessity for care in the use of the word Socialism, a caution especially needed at the time because of the eagerness with which two extreme opposing parties were trying, for different reasons, to identify the Labour Party with Socialism. After disclaiming any purpose of engaging in the political discussion between Liberals and Conservatives, he deprecated efforts to identify Socialism with social reform. He defined Socialism in terms of Collectivism and

advocated in lieu of this ideal the improvement of the present social order. Speaking of the so-called "Municipal Socialism" of Glasgow, he pointed out that "the question of public control and ownership is eminently a practical question, varying with times and circumstances, sometimes more, sometimes less—less, for example, where as in the United States, there is a lack of well trained and incorruptible officials; more for example, in Prussia where such officials can be found, and people are accustomed to the obedience of military and bureaucratic discipline." ²⁶

In that part of his speech which he devoted to the impractical nature of Socialism, he considered successively the difficulties inseparable from the administration of the socialised state—i.e. the difficulty of organising work, the difficulty of supplying different wants, the difficulty of assigning different employment, the difficulty of computing remuneration and the difficulty of providing a stimulating motive for work. He held that organisation would be impossible with shifting frontiers and shifting populations, individuality of taste would be replaced by an almost barrack-room uniformity, and thorough-going Socialism would permit the state to encroach upon the prerogatives of the Christian family. Moreover, small peasant holdings would be swept away with other private property in the Socialist State. Finally, in a sense, Socialism was the offspring of Atheism. But Atheism was the real enemy, "our arch-foe. Among godless property-holders, godless employers, godless work-people, there can be no lasting accord; alone under the wings of religion can social and domestic peace find a lasting refuge." ²⁷

FURTHER NOTES ON ENGLISH CATHOLICS AND SOCIALISM

An instructive booklet might be written on the attitude of Catholics in England toward the Socialist movement. Here it is not possible to do more than indicate in a general way the extent and nature of the opposition, and support this by occasional detail. Certain characteristics distinguish Catholic attacks on Socialism in England. For one thing, they are not combined with

apologies for the present social order. The abuses of the current economic dispensation are cried down at the same time that the Socialistic remedy is denounced. Then, too, there is not too much harping on certain philosophical and sociological bye-products of the movement, but a concentration instead on the fundamental economic theory which makes it unique. Attention is frequently called to that inaccuracy in the use of terms which labels many things as Socialism which are not distinctively such. Occasional sympathy is shown with all but extreme manifestations of the movement.

Back in 1888, W. S. Lilly wrote that the work of the thinker was not to deride what he called the crude schemes of Socialism but to discern the huge unpalatable truth that was in it and to shape that truth to some useful end. Twenty years later the Bishop of Salford lecturing on "The Spiritual Side of Social Work" declared that probably the majority of the reforms advocated by Socialists were in complete harmony with Catholic teaching, but behind Catholicism and Socialism were irreconcilable philosophies of life. The Rev. C. Leteux, writing to a Catholic newspaper in the same year, had besought Catholics to have more to say about social reform and less to say against Socialism.²⁸

At times, however, the spirit of conciliation has been absent, and the standard of war has been raised. In 1907 at the Conference of the Catholic Truth Society, notice was taken of the spread of Socialism, and Catholics were urged to combat it. Dr. Mooney, for example, dilated on the impractical nature of the movement and warned against the moral dangers which inhered in it. Arthur J. O'Connor, writing on the Socialist Movement in England, deplored the spread of Socialistic ideas among English working men. The S.D.F., the I.L.P. and the Fabian Society—the chief Socialist organisations—were very active as propagandists. He asserted that because of the apathy of their opponents the Socialists had gone far towards obtaining control of the trade unions and of the whole labour movement.²⁹

It was probably such attitudes as these that led the editor of the *Socialist Review* to write that while he deplored any action on the

part of Socialists which would involve them in conflict with any religion, he saw an effort on the part of Catholic clergymen to bring their church into conflict with Socialism. "The most ignorant and malignant attacks upon Socialism within recent years have come from Catholic quarters."³⁰

An anonymous writer in the *Dublin Review* for 1910 held that only a change of heart on the part of capitalists would save society from State Socialism.³¹

In 1911 and 1912, respectively, the Catholic Truth Society issued two books, both entitled *Catholicism and Socialism*. Each volume contained articles, some of them reprints, by various writers, clerical and lay, devoted to criticism on both economic and ethical grounds of the Socialist solution of the problems of present day industrial society. Some of the contributors took the reader a little off the beaten track. Father Rickaby S. J., for example, seemed willing to grant a considerable diminution in the amount of private capital, and looked forward to a time when private and communal capital would work side by side to their mutual advantage, the one acting as a corrective to the abuses of the other.³²

Father John Ashton, another Jesuit, who contributed a paper on "Socialism and Religion," posited the following pertinent question: "May we . . . be Catholic Socialists and join any of the various Socialist bodies in the country? Certainly by doing so we shall not become heretics, which means that we shall continue to remain in communion with the other Catholics throughout the world. Also, I am free to admit that there have been good Catholics who called themselves Socialists, though they have been neither so numerous nor so distinctively socialistic as some writers, notably Professor Nitti in his work on Catholic Socialism, would have it . . . there is reason to doubt whether such social reformers as Ketteler, Manning and de Mun would go so far in the direction of Socialism now that, having allied itself with the cult of humanity, it is openly hostile to every form of supernatural religion."³³

The well-known English Jesuit preacher, Father Bernard Vaughan, while on a visit to the United States in 1912, preached

a course of six lenten conferences in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, on the subject of Socialism. These with four additional conferences he collected in a volume entitled *Socialism from the Christian Standpoint*. He approached his topic with his customary vim, regarding it as the duty of Catholics to point out that Socialism was economically unsound, philosophically false and ethically wrong. He criticised Socialists for following the school of Auguste Comte, Saint Simon and Hegel, in taking the biological concept of society as a literal fact rather than a useful analogy and deducing from it a quite unpardonable glorification of the State. On the practical side he employed such familiar arguments as the probable encroachments of the Socialist State on the precincts of family life.⁸⁴

A couple of years later still another English Jesuit, Father Henry Day, drew up a case against Socialism in a book in which he likewise expounded Catholic social principles and made clear the continuity of their historical development.⁸⁵

The eve of the war witnessed some decline in Socialism in England, as made manifest chiefly by the defeat of Socialists in bye-elections in 1913 and in the growing disintegration of the philosophic basis of the system.⁸⁶

Meanwhile, in the relations between Catholics and the Socialist movement one or two interesting episodes had occurred. One concerns the history of the short-lived Catholic Socialist Society of Leeds. The organisation owed its inception to the activities of a young Catholic student of economics, Mr. Henry Somerville, whose idea of a Catholic Socialist Society, interestingly enough, was born not of his enthusiasm for Socialism, but of his fidelity to the Catholic Church. He believed that Socialism was fated to triumph and felt that it behooved Catholics to line up on the side of the winner. While Socialism made little appeal to him as an economic theory he could not see wherein it was incompatible with the teachings of the Catholic Church. He eventually abandoned that position as the result of misgivings arising from his discovery that while there was involved no question of definition by ecumenical council or "ex cathedra" pronouncement by a

pope, the Church as a movement, as a living body, was undoubtedly hostile to Socialism. He sought the essential point of antagonism and found it in the question of private property. So much for the process of reasoning by which the ardent young economist came to abandon his position. But what of the Socialist organisation which he and fourteen other young Catholics had brought into being? The local bishop condemned it by name in a pastoral letter. The little group submitted to this disciplinary measure and the Catholic Socialist Society passed out of existence. A similar venture which had arisen under Wheatley at Glasgow likewise collapsed.³⁷

Just before the outbreak of the Great War, a couple of laymen called in a lawyer to examine the publications of the Catholic Social Guild for alleged radical tendencies. The Report, which will be mentioned more fully in the chapter on the Guild, emanating as it did from a group of conservative Catholics, stressed what seemed to be a bias in favour of Socialism and expressed anxiety lest that viewpoint appear to have authoritative force.³⁸

Shortly after this episode there appeared in the *Tablet* an enumeration of different types of Socialism, to which was appended the statement "To each and all of these systems or doctrines, as understood by their respective promoters and in the common and obvious meaning of the terms employed, the C. S. G. has always been solidly and on Catholic principles in total and unqualified opposition. . . . We have not attacked the Socialist professedly because our main purpose has been constructive."³⁹

In 1918, Father Vincent McNabb sought to correct an impression which he believed had been conveyed by Dr. John A. Ryan in a series of articles on "The Catholic Church and Socialism" which the latter had contributed to the New York *Evening Mail*. Dr. Ryan, in the opinion of Father McNabb, had given the impression that Pope Leo had condemned all kinds of Socialism. Dr. Ryan replied that he was writing only of orthodox regular Socialism. He agreed that the papal condemnation had not extended to Guild Socialism, Christian Socialism, Revisionist Socialism or any other mild form of the theory.⁴⁰

Articles have appeared from time to time in the columns of the periodical publication of the Catholic Social Guild, the *Christian Democrat*, setting forth Catholic opinions on Socialism. Although very little new has been offered, the articles are distinguished for clarity and moderation. A review of Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *Decay of Capitalist Civilisation* appeared in one of the issues of 1923. Tribute was paid to their masterly treatment of the subject; but to their failure to grasp the moral nature of the economic problem was ascribed their fatalism and depression. What seemed an inevitable doom, in which Socialism would be powerless to replace the rapidly crumbling capitalist industry, might be arrested through the moral regeneration of society.⁴¹

A few years ago Mr. Somerville made some interesting reflections on the prevailing nature of British Socialism. "Its method is legal, parliamentary action; its goal is something that eye hath not seen nor ear heard; it is not the public ownership that used to satisfy Socialists and which already operated in undertakings like the Post Office—it is to be a sort of hybrid of public ownership and workers' control such as never has existed and which cannot be hinted at save in barest outline." Whatever its future, he declared, it had no past.⁴²

ANTI-STATISTS AND DISTRIBUTIVISTS: BELLOC, CHESTERTON, McNABB

Rivalling the exponents of Socialism in their fierce opposition to the evils of modern industrial society, is a little group of English Catholics who join with others not of their faith in advocating a solution which is the direct antithesis of that offered by the Socialists. Instead of favouring the transference of capital from its few private owners to the political community, they believe in a widespread increase in the number of its possessors. Committed to diffusion in lieu of concentration, they would substitute the Distributive for the Socialist State.

G. K. Chesterton, Hilaire Belloc and Father Vincent McNabb are the prophets of the new dispensation. In common with other

observers of English economic life—from the Sidney Webbs to Trotsky—they are convinced that the full-blown flower of industrialism is soon to wither. This gives them cause for rejoicing, for not only do they regard modern capitalism as an abomination which should vanish as soon as possible from the face of the earth, but they have a touching longing for the return of the small farmer as a factor in English life. They would see “a bold peasantry, their country’s pride” rise up to replace the great army of industrial workers whose sufferings now cry to heaven for vengeance. The Distributivists frankly include in their programme a return to mediaeval conditions of society as conceived by themselves. Unless the very memory of the Industrial Revolution could be effaced from the minds of men, it is difficult to see how this could be accomplished.

The following brisk remarks of Mr. Belloc embody the views on present conditions to which this group adheres: “Everyone worth talking to, everyone fit for human companionship and association, everyone but an insignificant group of men—some half-witted, some base, some superhumanly ignorant, many mere politicians—everyone, I say, not only in the sense of the vast majority of the men concerned, but in the sense of the vast preponderance of the intellect and heart concerned, is determined that our modern industrial system shall be transformed. . . . Some few of those whom, after a fashion . . . the industrial system benefits, indulge from time to time in a special defence of it, but there is never any stuff in that defence; no one can take it seriously. The greater part of the capitalist class who control the industrial system deliberately keep silence upon it.”⁴³

Mr. Belloc has combined his propaganda for Distributivism with attacks on Socialism, and harks back to mediaeval economic conceptions and the customs in Catholic communities today. “The average English non-Catholic, being cut off from his Catholic past, does not know that there ever was a society in which wealth was well distributed. He imagines capitalism to have existed from all time, to be native to our blood, and there-

fore to be the only alternative to Socialism and the inevitable extreme of Socialism—Communism.”

His views may be briefly summed up. He advocates a wide distribution of wealth amongst Christian families and the creation of an economic public opinion which should prevent the usurpation by a few of the right of all. Since as already indicated the theory of Distributivism involves a “back to the land” exodus from sooty factory towns, he would see introduced into England small peasant proprietorships. The farmer whose prestige has been eclipsed by the urban proletarian is to come into his own. Since Mr. Belloc regards industrial capitalism as the logical outcome of the Protestant Revolt, he urges as an antidote to its evils the dissemination of Catholic principles, and points with triumph to the predominantly agrarian character of those homogeneous Catholic societies—southern Ireland, southern Germany—which, having resisted the onward march of industrialism, seem about to be vindicated for an attitude once thought foolish.

Meanwhile, in his opinion, industrial legislation can only lead to the establishment of the “Servile State,” that is, a paternalistic condition of society in which the lives of the masses of the people would be controlled by a clique of wealthy men buttressed by public laws. Compulsory arbitration, for example, could be used as a weapon to force the proletariat to work. As to the Collectivist State, likewise suggested as a remedy for the present impasse, it would, though such was not its object, result in the further enslavement of the working class. Mr. Belloc is convinced that only widely distributed capital can save the day.⁴⁴

Similar ideas pervade the writings of Mr. G. K. Chesterton, from his charming detective stories to his more serious ventures. Industrial capitalism, of which he wrote in his *Irish Impressions* that Belfast was the besieged and almost deserted outpost, is sick unto death, and he—Mr. Chesterton—cannot be numbered among the afflicted watchers; rather does he wait impatiently for the end.

However much he may disappoint us as a serious economist, he seldom fails to please as a keen observer of social phenomena,

and there are times when he intrigues by the more than modicum of truth in his humorous comments. A few observations of his will illustrate his approach to such topics. It were best to set them down verbatim. G. K. Chesterton's style defies attempts at paraphrasing. His ideas do not lend themselves to condensation into pithy digests.

" . . . As I went by Charing Cross my eye caught a poster about Labour politics, with something about the threat of Direct Action and a demand for Nationalisation . . . the Labour men talk about the need to 'nationalise' the mines or the land, as if it were not the great difficulty in a plutocracy to nationalise the Government, or even to nationalise the nation. The Capitalists praise competition while they create monopoly; the Socialists urge a strike to turn workmen into soldiers and state officials; which is logically a strike against strikes. . . . My own sympathies are with the Socialists; in so far as there is something to be said for Socialism, and nothing to be said for Capitalism. But the point is that when there is something to be said for one thing, it is now commonly said in support of the opposite thing. . . . the strikers demand Government control and the Government denounces its own control as anarchy. The crowd howls before the palace gates, 'Hateful tyrant, we demand that you assume more despotic powers'; and the tyrant thunders from the balcony, 'Vile rebels do you dare to suggest that my powers should be extended?' There seems to be a little misunderstanding somewhere." ⁴⁵

"It was the reliance on coal, and the resolution to exploit coal, that is largely responsible for making us 'the workshop of the world' or, in other words, putting us in permanent danger of being locked out of the larder of the world. In any grave defeat we might be shut up in our workshops and told to feed on hammers and tin-tacks. John Bull put himself very much in the position of King Midas, in asking that all he touched might turn to iron and then to gold; and some would say he resembled the same great financial magnate in the shape of his ears.

"But I am not talking about the principles of political economy,

but about the probabilities of human nature. Suppose the Empire, as erected on coal and coaling stations, did lead all its people to something that no patriotic people can forgive, any more than the French could forgive the Empire that led them to Sedan. Suppose coal became rather a painful memory for us, as blood and iron must now be a rather painful memory for the Germans. Is it not obvious that a thousand associations and allusions would become equally odious; and that the whole historic transformation of green England into grimy England would be seen as a single tragedy? In the file of all the figures of the past, anyone who had touched coal would be defiled." ⁴⁶

Chesterton, like Belloc, would see an English peasantry revived. Society has suffered in its absence and would be transformed by its presence. "It will be a somewhat different England in which the peasant has to be considered at all. It will begin to alter the look of things, even when politicians think about peasants as often as they do about doctors. They have been known even to think about soldiers." ⁴⁷

But the ardent defender, par excellence, of the charms of husbandry is the clerical member of this trio, the Dominican preacher, Vincent McNabb. His georgic is inspired by zeal for the rights of the poor, condemned to wretchedness in the slums of large cities. He has boldly stated that poverty is an evil—always and essentially a physical and an economic evil, usually and causally, a moral evil as well. Poverty, a deficiency of the things necessary for the bare efficient upkeep of human life, is wrong, and as we find it in society today it is the result of the sin of theft. Leo XIII, in Father McNabb's opinion, expressed that view when he spoke in his Encyclical of the "misery and wretchedness pressing so heavily and so unjustly on the vast majority of the working classes." If some souls have thrived on poverty it has been due to the exercise of the human will which can draw good from evil. He quoted Frederic Ozanam's statement that not God but human liberty had made the poor. Father McNabb offered a practical proposal—namely, that religious bodies with their vows of poverty, especially mendicant

friars, should take their own standards of living as the minimum standard for the poor! ⁴⁸

He has grown lyric over the land and mingled the praise of its glories with praises of God. Reducing his enthusiasm to practical terms he would solve the evils of modern industrial life—urban congestion and unemployment, and the train of physical suffering and moral ills which they entail—by subjecting once more the untilled acres of England to the spade and the harrow. ⁴⁹

Father McNabb recently garnered his thoughts on the subject into a book of essays called *The Church and the Land*, a volume containing much which is inspiring and much which fails to convince. Like Rowntree and others he recognises the urgent need of land reform in Britain and like Professor Scott he realises that a back-to-the-land movement would be productive of salutary social and economic results. But the agriculture he would see revived is of a primitive type. Elaborate machinery must be discarded. Even specialised farming because it would be dependent on modern transport—and the latter is anathema to him—should not be encouraged. Unlike most land reformers, he opposes the industrialisation of agriculture and would see England again an England of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. ⁵⁰

Even those who deplore as he deplores the shifting of the center of gravity of society until the change has resulted in the urbanisation of the world, even those who having passed through such a crisis as the Great War, know that we are all forced back upon the soil for sustenance,—that in a very vital sense we eat our bread in the sweat of our brow,—may yet wonder how all this is to come to pass, and wonder further if life's miseries inevitably evaporate in the sweet air of the countryside. There all may be divine but the spirit of man. The soul of the farmer is not necessarily pure, and it may be as cunning and as cruel as the elemental things that surround him. Nature herself has not been known to discriminate between town and country in her less lovely moods. Centuries before industrial cities like Liverpool and Leeds loomed up like so many ugly blots upon the landscape, the

people of Christendom prayed to be delivered from the ravages of famine and plague.

The question might not unfittingly be asked: What would be the fate of machinery in the Distributive State? Anything might happen to it from scrapping to redistribution. Only its concentration in the hands of a few capitalists, as at present, or its transference to the political community, as proposed by the Socialists, would be ruled out. Should there be a widespread allotment of machines, so that each family, if not each citizen, would rejoice in the ownership of some technical instrument of production and thus feel as (theoretically) independent of a neighbour as every nation would be of every other in an ideal mercantilist world? Is large-scale industry to collapse before a return of handicraft methods of production?

The ideal seems fantastic, though there are strivings toward it. Witness the life lived by the community of laymen who have set up St. Dominic's press where the members not only make their own beverages and bread, but print books and produce works of art without the aid of elaborate machinery. This state of affairs is probably only the fulfillment of a counsel of perfection. The most enthusiastic disciple of Distributivism would scarcely advocate it for the mass of weak mankind. A really practical suggestion is contained in an article written by Maurice B. Reckitt in reply to a criticism directed against a previous one by Mr. Penty. The writer points out that the clue to effective popular control of machinery lies not in an extension of ownership but in a distribution of shares, or rather a universalisation of dividends. The monopoly of finance must be wrested from the hands of the capitalist and returned to the workers and the little owners—even to the employers. There must be a disintegration of financial monopoly, a decentralisation of economic power. In this way only could there be true distribution. This transformation was needed "to make machinery subservient to vocation or industry compatible with freedom."⁵¹

GUILD SOCIALISM

The group whose ideas have just been described derive their inspiration from a consideration of the culture of the Middle Ages. They ride on the crest of a wave of reaction against the injustice done to that period by historians who were wont to describe it as a time of unrelieved barbarity and gloom. The last quarter of a century has witnessed repeated and often very successful efforts to rehabilitate the Middle Ages. In many cases the former unscholarly denunciation has given place to equally uncritical laudation, and the grim features of those turbulent times have been relegated to the background. Only a spectacle of lofty accomplishments is presented to our admiring eyes. "There were giants in those days," and many zealous souls of the twentieth century act as if they would have gladly sacrificed the comforts of our effete era for a chance to live in that more virile epoch. Not only has mediaeval scholarship won the belated plaudits of modern thinkers, but other features of that civilisation have come into their own. Sometimes an appreciation of one has induced an interest in another, as the contemplation of Gothic architecture led Mr. Arthur Penty to study the economic and social conditions which formed a congenial background for such colossal achievements.

Catholicism has exerted an indirect influence on the movement known as Guild Socialism through this revival of interest in a period which owed its civilisation to the Catholic Church. Serious students of economics have been thrilled by the mediaeval guild system, an institution about which a few scholars know a little and numerous enthusiasts think they know much. Catholic influence has made itself felt directly by the encouragement given by some Catholics to the attitude of hostility both to the present economic phase and to the Collectivism with which many reformers would replace it. Mr. Chesterton and Mr. Belloc, for example, have used their active pens in contributing to a discussion of economic evils and their remedies which has raged in the very liberal columns of the outspoken *New Age*.

The central idea of the National Guild System seems to be the democratic control of industry. In spite of efforts at clarification by its chief exponents, S. G. Hobsön, Orage, Penty and Cole, and careful studies such as that furnished by Carpenter, the whole scheme remains too vague as to its general nature and too divergent in its details to be susceptible of clear exposition. No doubt at the root of the difficulty is the fact that no two advocates have the same thing in mind. Certain features, however, stand out. It is neither Individualistic nor Socialistic, though it has elements in common with the latter system, and probably even more points of contact with theoretical Syndicalism. There is behind the movement a tacit assumption of the Marxian theory of value and an inspiration drawn from revolutionary trade unionism. Political action as a means of securing social reform is rejected in favour of a transformation of present craft or trade unions into industrial unions. In the fulness of time, these by their cumulative aggressive strength, will wrest capital from its present private owners and hand it over to the state, its actual control reverting by a sort of lease to a hierarchy of guilds—the previously mentioned industrial unions. Managers of industry are to be chosen by the workers, and the present wage-system as all know it and all do not love it is to be repudiated in favour of some supposedly fairer system of payment. Capitalists will no longer revel in surplus profits.

Advocates of the National Guild System differ as to whether this elaborate scheme for industrial rule by industry itself is to be worked in behalf of large-scale production or through simpler pre-Arkwright methods. Cole contemplates no essential alteration in the factory system and existing industrial organisation. He foresees merely such democratic control of industry as will result in increased freedom for the worker without any concomitant impairment of the efficiency of production. Penty, on the other hand, frankly advocates a return to small scale industry, with small local guilds instead of the large national ones beloved of Cole. In fact, Penty's brand of Guild Socialism is not, strictly speaking, the National Guild System. He is enthralled by a vision

of mediaeval handicraft and regards machinery as something intrinsically inimical to the most attractive phases of civilisation. Nay more, the collapse of our machine-industry is not only desirable but inevitable. The saturation point has been reached: society can endure no further industrialisation. The grim struggle that went on not so long ago between German and English capitalists for control of world markets, and the continued spread of unemployment in industries bereft of extra-national consumers may be taken as portents of the beginning of the end.⁵²

In any case, the economic life of the community is to be controlled by the industries that compose it by means of a group of guilds, each representative of a distinct occupation, the whole system to converge in a central industrial congress.⁵³

The purely political destinies of people living under a Guild Socialist régime would be directed by a popular body elected to coördinate activities within the state, with a special view to promoting the general good of the people as consumers, and to represent it in its relations with foreign countries.⁵⁴

No mention has been made of the important question of finance under Guild Socialism. This omission is due to what was recognised for a long time as an outstanding weakness of the system. More recently, a social credit scheme, proposed by Major Douglas and enthusiastically acclaimed by Mr. Orage as a sort of protective covering for Achilles' heel, appears to some to have solved this baffling problem. Others see in its details so sharp a departure from the orthodox type of Guild Socialism as to suggest a distinct variation of the species. Still a third class of commentators regard it as intricate to the point of unintelligibility. No effort will be made here to explain this proposed device for the control of credit by the community as a whole instead of by a clique of financiers. The plan is too technical and too involved to admit of hasty summary. It is mentioned for the purpose of filling in what might be considered a hiatus in the discussion of Guild Socialism. Interested readers can turn to the literature of exposition and criticism which has already begun to grow up around the subject.⁵⁵

Friends of the *New Age* displayed no affection for the parliamentary Labour Party. Mr. Cecil Chesterton a few years before his death wrote a series of articles celebrating "The Decline and Fall of the Labour Party." More recently Mr. Orage gave as his opinion that the party's brief tenure of power was accidental and of relatively trivial import; and predicted that England would be ruled by a second Labour Government no sooner than a decade after the overthrow of the first.⁵⁶

So much for the general nature of the movement. Attention can now be directed to a consideration of specific Catholic influence and reaction.

Father Charles Plater, whose work in behalf of the Catholic Social Guild will be considered in the next chapter, early issued a warning against current efforts to resurrect the guilds with an unhistorical literalness. "We shall only make ourselves ridiculous by advocating impossible measures such as the restoration of the old guild system in all its details. What we need to do is rather to recover the social spirit which animated these guilds, and to embody it in institutions adapted to modern needs. This is a task of enormous difficulty and complexity, and demands untiring and concerted study."⁵⁷

Mr. G. K. Chesterton once expressed the fear that the modern guild would fall heir to what he called the boredom and sameness of capitalism. The management of a big guild was in danger of bearing too striking a resemblance to the management of a big firm. Nevertheless, his hearty dislike of modern industrialism has been cited by the sponsors of the National Guild idea as an element creative of a sympathetic background for their theories. In his statement that any denial today of the divine rights of the capitalists is in effect a revolution, they have seen an anticipation of the moment when the workers having grasped the need for revolutionary action would turn the trade unions to new ends.⁵⁸

Indeed, Chesterton showed real sympathy with the spirit behind the movement in the introduction which he wrote to Penty's *Post-Industrialism*. Assuming the collapse of industrial capitalism, he

was far from unfriendly to the system which in the opinion of the author seemed best fitted to replace it.⁵⁹

To the ideas of Belloc, the Guild Socialists probably owed more than to those of Chesterton. Cole in his indictment of the theory of state omni-competence shows that, whereas in the absence of those social institutions and associations which in the Middle Ages had directed the life of the community side by side with the State, the recent assumption of vast powers by the latter had been to a degree for the protection of the private citizen, the general result was an infringement of personal liberty. He supported the contention of Belloc that the trend in modern society was toward the creation of the Servile State. Beckhofer and Reckitt likewise mentioned Belloc as having contributed to the principles behind the theory of National Guilds.⁶⁰

From Mr. Belloc, however, have come some serious criticisms of the National Guild System. In a series of articles which he wrote for the *New Age* in October and November, 1913, he grouped the various possibilities for Guild organisation under four general heads and examined each in turn. His criticism was in the main destructive. Only one possible type made any appeal to him—namely, that which would make provision that the men organised in a guild for the purpose of controlling the conditions of the labour in their particular industry should possess individual property either in that Guild or elsewhere. Mr. Belloc's followers, the members of the Rota Club, developed his general anti-guild position in a series of essays, and (of christening theories there is no end!) decided that the political community in which the favoured distributive guilds would thrive should be known as the Associative State.⁶¹

Belloc included among the three schemes which he discarded the favourite type of organisation of the majority of professed National Guildmen: the scheme based on a quasi-partnership between the proletarian Guilds and the State, the latter replacing private capitalists and leasing capital to the Guilds. Needless to say, thoroughgoing Guild Socialists while grateful to Mr. Belloc for his opposition to their own pet aversions, the type of economic

organisation which now exists and the type into which State Socialists wish to transform the present system, were quite naturally cold to his despair of the efficacy of their plans unless they should be made to include a generous admixture of Distributivism. Especially did his apparent insistence on the rights of the individual property holder instead of on social justice, his emphasis on state rather than trade union action, and his introduction of the idea of shares and profits, seem to them incompatible with their social theories.⁶²

In 1918, the Catholic Social Guild got out a study of Guild Socialism, written by Francis Goldwell. After an interesting account of the antecedents of the theory of National Guilds and a description of the general features of the movement, he subjected it to a critical analysis. He praised the idea of synthetic organisation but doubted its practicality in a country where class distinctions were as sharply drawn as in England. There was also the problem of combining the craft unions into national industrial guilds. These difficulties, however, he admitted were not insuperable. Nor was even that yet more arduous feat of actually getting control of production and marketing impossible of accomplishment. In this connection, though, he held that the general strike—the most frequently suggested means—was morally unjustifiable. The expropriation of capitalists, if deemed necessary, should be accompanied with due compensation.

The writer lauded the concept of justice behind the guild idea as admirably consonant with religious principles and traditions. But there were practical dangers discernible in the scheme such as the menace to individual freedom and initiative inherent in the vastness of the proposed organisations as well as the danger to liberty resulting from the vesting of all productive property in the State. There was also a challenge to national integrity in the proposed balance of functions between two governing bodies, and the absence of any fixed repository of sovereign power. The devices suggested by Penty and Cole for the removal of these obstacles seemed inadequate to the writer.

He also assailed the doctrine of the State and the doctrine of

property subscribed to by the National Guildmen and called them the central heresies of the movement. Guild Socialists had to reduce the former to a shadowy existence menacing to the stability of orderly government; and, regarding property, they had fallen into the error of urging the abolition of private ownership when they might better strive for its conversion, and hence its regenerated life. The kind of guild suggested by Belloc in which the individual members should be possessed of private property seemed to him the only type capable of combining the benefits of control over production by the producers themselves with such a measure of personal liberty as would insure protection against the encroachments of the very officials of the guild. For himself, he felt that Guild Socialism was a very great advance over the revolts that had preceded it. But like all other schemes of social reform it must, to be effective, be infused with the Christian spirit.⁶³

Mr. Henry Somerville of the Catholic Social Guild in an article written for an American periodical in 1926 praised the guild movement as a means of solving economic conflicts by the extension of the principle of democracy to the field of industrial relationships. The proposed plan had the additional merit of being susceptible of partial and limited application. Experimentation could be conducted on a small scale.⁶⁴

COMMUNISM

With Communism, Catholics in England—as elsewhere—have no sympathetic points of contact. The reason for this antipathy is not far to seek. It springs at once from the central tenet of communistic dogma—namely, that of compulsory collectivism applicable not only to the means of production but to consumers' wealth as well—and from the avowed hostility of communists in theory and in practice to religious beliefs and religious institutions. The idea of enforced community of goods runs counter to Catholic teaching on property. Communist publications, moreover, do not speak very temperately of churches; and communist experiments—

such as that of the Bolsheviks in Russia—are likely to be marked by violent measures against religion and its agents. In these two facts is distilled the essence of the antagonism between the two. Buharin and Preobrazhensky affirm in their *A.B.C. of Communism* the incompatibility of religion and the theories that they teach; and an English Catholic theologian in the same sentence in which he asserted that the speculations of the Socialist were sometimes deep alluded to the Communist as a madman.⁶⁵

Considerable confusion has resulted from the fact that for years the words Socialism and Communism were practically synonymous. For historical reasons explained by Engels in his introduction to the 1888 English edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, he and Marx had deliberately selected “communist” instead of “socialist” as the adjective most accurately descriptive of that famous document in the year that it was first given to the world. In the course of time the rank and file of Marxian Socialists came to inscribe its words upon their banners; the yet more radical left-wingers ultimately went forth to battle under a standard of their own—the red flag of Communism. Leo XIII’s well-known condemnation of Socialism is in effect a condemnation of Communism—for he stated in his Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* that the main tenet of Socialism was community of goods; and were the famous statesman-pontiff alive today he would be forced to acknowledge that much of what is now called Socialism would not have fallen under his ban.⁶⁶

This present distinction makes a discussion of the attitude of British Catholics toward Communism a relatively simple matter. The subject need not be treated at length. English Communists are neither so numerous nor so influential as to constitute an important factor in social movements in England. At the same time the reason for Catholic opposition to their propaganda is almost so obvious that a detailed exposition of it would approach the tedious. A few paragraphs will suffice.

There is a Communist Party in England, a branch of the Communist International, with a membership of probably five thousand. Although it has exerted no little influence in trade union

circles the leaders of the Labour Party have steadily refused to permit it to affiliate with their organisation. The Communist viewpoint is spread chiefly by literature and schools. A few years ago Communist schools were founded with the blessing of Moscow, and they form a strategic center of training for the budding Bolsheviks of the British Isles.⁶⁷

But Communism is not only a variety of academic speculation. It is likewise a state of feeling produced by a sense of the futility of peaceful methods as a means of escape from a social environment of heart-breaking oppressiveness. Though the statement that man is "alles Gefühl" is less than a half-truth, the most ardent defender of the rational nature of the human being would if honest—and introspective—be forced to admit that at least some of his ideas are generated by his emotions. In so far as Communism not only presents a theory but voices a protest, and in the sense that it is a programme as well as a creed, it has not been without appeal to the Catholic proletariat of Great Britain. For this reason the Catholic Truth Society and the Catholic Social Guild have gotten out publications to make clear to workingmen the un-Christian teachings of Communism with regard to property, the family and the Church, and to reiterate the self-evident fact that no Catholic can be a Communist.⁶⁸

On the last day of May, 1925, Father Leo O'Hea, Secretary of the Catholic Social Guild, read a paper on Catholics and Communism before the annual Conference of Catholic Young Men's Societies of Great Britain, his address receiving wide and favourable notice in both the religious and secular press. In a clear-cut fashion he outlined the chief arguments against Communism: the avowed atheism of its advocates and their irreligious aims, the doctrine of materialistic determinism that permeated the movement, and its emphasis on the need for a new "system" to the exclusion of the equally important need for personal regeneration. Catholics demanded reform but on grounds that could not be claimed by the determinist; for rights could exist only where there was free will and responsibility and there could be justice only where there were rights. The speaker called upon Catholics to

do their part in promoting schemes for social betterment. "In many of these things," he said, "we can work side by side with others with whom we may disagree on most fundamental matters of principle. If the Communist is trying to get houses built then work your hardest alongside of the Communist."⁶⁹

Professed Anarchists of English lineage are even rarer birds than professed English Communists. It is a foregone conclusion that Catholics have no friendly relations with them. Anarchists repudiate any kind of government imposed from above and believe instead in the feasibility of voluntary groupings. Like their Russian brethren, the Nihilists, probably first defined by Turgenev in *Fathers and Children*, they do not bow before any authority and they refuse to accept a single principle on faith. To attempt an explanation of the incompatibility of Catholicism and Anarchy would be to undertake a work of supererogation.

CATHOLICS AND THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY

Just as there is no reason why a Catholic should be found in the Communist Party, there is no reason why he should not be a member of an English Trade Union. Theoretically, such combinations embody the Catholic idea of the right—indeed the immense advantage—of voluntary association; and in practice trade unions in Great Britain are accustomed to embark upon no such irreligious enterprises as would make Catholic abstention from co-operation with them an act of self-preservation.

Whenever there is a divergence in programme between Catholic Trade Unionists and their non-Catholic fellows in consequence of irreconcilable ethical concepts, Catholics in England prefer working through their unions for a change in policy to adopting separatist tactics and forming trade unions of their own, as is the custom in some parts of the world. Back in the eighteen-eighties while Manning was carrying on his social action almost single handed, the conservative *Tablet* contributed its paean to the praise of trade unionism. From that day to this with the exception of occasional disagreements regarding such questions as

secularised education and easy divorce, there has been complete accord between the Catholic Church in England and the Trade Union movement.⁷⁰

Since the trade union element predominates in the British Labour Party, further discussion of Catholics and Trade Unionists in Great Britain can be merged with a consideration of their relations with that political body.

The various trade unions began to hold annual conferences in 1870, and it was in the seventies that they were accorded legal recognition. About the same time, Labour entered the political field. In 1868 two Labour candidates stood for Parliament, and in 1874 two out of thirteen Labour candidates were elected. Nearly twenty years later the Independent Labour Party was organised, but its Socialistic complexion kept it from gaining the allegiance of the majority of British workmen. The way was left clear for the formation of the Labour Representation Committee as a result of steps taken at the Trades Union Congress in 1899. This group, pledged at first to coöperate with any party in the House of Commons which at a given time should be furthering labour legislation, took the name of the Labour Party in 1906 and elected twenty-nine out of fifty-one candidates for Parliament.⁷¹

The Party suffered a decline shortly after its first Parliamentary triumph and showed a tendency to move with what was to some exasperating caution. Its revival and its greater radicalism date from the year 1918. During the War, the plodding trade union leaders had received something of a jolt from the Shop Steward movement which frankly aimed at political and industrial organisation by a system of committees in a manner suggestive of the Russian Soviets. The government had not been idle in its efforts to meet the problems of future social reconstruction. One active sub-committee that had as its chairman the Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley, M.P., suggested the setting up of joint industrial councils, representing employers and employed. But its recommendations, like those of the other committees, paled into insignificance beside the aggressive policy of the awakened Labour Party.⁷²

Before the close of 1917 the Labour Party appointed its com-

mittee of reconstruction and early in 1918 it issued its Report, a masterly pronouncement called *Labour and the New Social Order. A Report on Reconstruction by the Sub-Committee of the British Labour Party*. It was obviously the product of the mind and method of Sidney Webb and was couched in a style characteristic of his powerful pen. The trade unions of Great Britain made his words their own.

"If we in Britain," so ran a passage in that portentous document, "are to escape from the decay of civilisation itself . . . we must ensure that what is presently to be built up is a new social order, based not on fighting, but on fraternity—not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in production and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or by brain—not on the utmost possible inequality of riches, but on a systematic approach towards a healthy equality of material circumstances for every person born into the world—not on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject colonies, subject classes or a subject sex, but, in industry as well as in government, on that equal freedom, that general consciousness of consent, and that widest participation in power both economic and political, which is characteristic of democracy." ⁷³

The four pillars of the house that they proposed to erect were the universal enforcement of the national minimum, the democratic control of industry, the revolution in national finance and the surplus wealth for the common good. The interests of peace dictated a democratic control of foreign policy.⁷⁴

It was likewise in 1918 that the Labour Party, by the adoption of its new constitution of which we shall hear more, was transformed from a Federation of Trade Unions, Socialist Societies, Coöperative Societies, Trades Councils, local Labour Parties and the Women's Labour League into a national political party, membership being open to every person accepting its programme and approving its aims. In this way were included numbers of people who were affiliated with neither a Trade Union nor a Socialist Society.⁷⁵

In the Fall of that year the Trades Union Congress at its convention at Derby came out for a thoroughgoing programme of not only social legislation of an ameliorative sort but for the nationalisation and democratic control of all natural resources, public services and land.⁷⁶

At the time of the General Election of 1918, so dexterously engineered by David Lloyd George, the Labour Party by a vote of 2,117,000 to 810,000 formally withdrew from the Coalition, though some Labourites did not heed the order and received coalition certificates—the “good tickets” handed out by the prime minister to the tractable of all political faiths. The Labour Party issued an election manifesto of far-reaching demands appealing to the electorate for little less than the readjustment of all human society to the conditions of a new era. In the election that followed, Lloyd George received his mandate to the peace conference and the Labour Party took its place as His Majesty’s Opposition.⁷⁷

In time the Coalition was replaced by a Conservative Government which fell toward the end of 1923 when Baldwin went to the country on the issue of protection. The election of that year revealed a marked growth in strength of the Labour Party which increased its Parliamentary representation by about forty members.⁷⁸

The Parliament which followed was unstable and of short duration, and in 1924 the first Labour Government in English history came into existence with Mr. Ramsay Macdonald as premier. Further allusion to this ministry as well as to the general election which before the end of the year swept it from office and replaced it by another Conservative régime will be made in the succeeding pages.

But first a word must be said of the relations of the Labour Party with Socialism, because as we shall see in the following account of the Catholic attitude toward the party, the problem of the propriety or the impropriety of Catholic affiliation with it pivots around the question of the weakness or strength of the out-and-out Socialist element that it contains.

In the early years of the organisation, Ramsay Macdonald

made the following statement: "The Labour Party is not Socialist. It is a union of Socialist and trade union bodies for immediate political work—the Social Democratic Party having joined it at first but after a year's coöperation having returned to its isolation in 1901. But it is the only political form which evolutionary Socialism can take in a country with the political traditions and methods of Great Britain. Under British conditions, a Socialist Party is the last, not the first, form of the Socialist movement in politics." ⁷⁹

In a long criticism of Mr. Macdonald's book, *The Socialist Movement*, from which the foregoing quotation was taken, Father Vincent McNabb wrote in high praise of both the author and the "New Socialism" which he expounded. He pointed out the points of resemblance between Pope Leo's ideas and many of those of Macdonald, and urged Catholic social students to disregard "mere labels" and look at "the thing in itself." ⁸⁰

The Socialists, who before the election of 1906 had joined the parliamentary labour organisation with a view to securing trade union support for their movement, found the affiliation blasting to their hopes when for several years subsequent to that time the policy of the Party was apparently dictated less by the interests of radical Labour than by a consideration of political expediency. Not only did it abandon aggressive tactics of its own, but it fell in amiably with the more advanced measures of the Liberal Party. Socialist Labourites were glum. Some attempted to form political organisations of their own and still others lost faith in the efficacy of partisan politics and aspired after industrial action instead. ⁸¹

Such an upheaval as the War was likely to intensify the radicalism of the progressively-minded and cement the conservatism of groups of people temperamentally adverse to change. It brought out the latent Socialism of the Labour Party and thus made the question of Catholic membership in the organisation one of practical importance. We shall shortly return to this subject. ⁸²

Not that this was the only issue, though it was and is the chief. Moreover, it was not the first. For about ten years,

Labour interests in England were committed to a policy of secularised education. Early in 1908, due to the pressure of Catholic Trade Unionists, who had just organised not for independent action, but to make their collective influence felt in the Labour Movement, came the first victory. Secularisation no longer appeared as an item in the programme of the Labour Party. At the Trades Union Congress of 1906, Mr. James Sexton had said that many workmen of deep religious feeling would refuse to contribute to the funds of a Party with a policy that imperilled religious teaching in the Schools. At the Trades Union Congress at Newport in 1912 it was voted to exclude a discussion of the question of secular education from the sessions of any future Congress. Mr. Thomas Burns, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists, pointed with pride to the achievement of his organisation. In 1918 Catholic Trade Unionists assembled at Leeds were asked to declare against Secular Education. However the usual conciliatory attitude of the Labour Party on this subject has practically banished it from the domain of live issues.⁸³

In the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1910 there was a chapter based on a lecture delivered by a well-known priest in the North of England in which an account was given of the non-Socialist origins of the Labour Party and a fear expressed that the Socialist element was tending to dominate its policies, not by force of numbers but by power of zeal. The Socialist Societies contributing to the Parliamentary Fund numbered 27,465 members, whereas the Trade Unions giving to the same fund numbered 1,121,256. Yet of the thirty-three Labour M.P.'s, twenty-five were avowed Socialists. The writer blamed the lethargy of non-Socialists for this state of affairs. He called upon them to shake off their apathy and participate more actively in Labour affairs.⁸⁴

When *Labour and the New Social Order* was published, the Catholic Social Guild issued a pamphlet written by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., in which he examined the basic principles of the Labour Programme and found them in accordance with Catholic doctrine. Mr. Lucas in discussing the same document called at-

tention to the fact that Cardinal Bourne in his Lenten Pastoral had likewise called for a "new order of things." ⁸⁵

It was, however, when the Labour Party adopted a new constitution declaring for the common ownership of the means of production that trouble arose. The question was mooted at the National Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists at Leeds, and a resolution was passed "That this Conference advises Catholic trade unionists to stop payment of the Parliamentary Levy to the Socialist Party, to oppose the affiliation of their respective trade unions to that Party, and to work inside their trade unions for the exclusion of Socialism from the Party." ⁸⁶

The Bishop of Northampton—now Archbishop of Liverpool—in his Lenten Pastoral for 1919, stated that though the Labour Party had come under the control of a Socialist executive the duty of Catholics was not to leave the Party but to purge it. Dr. Whiteside, the Archbishop of Liverpool, at a meeting in Wigan in October of the same year, made special reference to those who had urged that Catholics should not belong to the Labour Party. "He [the Archbishop] thought that he was breaking no confidence when he said that the whole question as to the position which had been taken up by the Labour Party in connection with the social formula was having the careful attention of the Holy See, and when Rome speaks, added his Grace, the question will be ended. We must wait until Rome speaks, and then we will know what to do . . . The Church had left them with liberty. Until the Church deprived them of it, let them stick to their liberty." ⁸⁷

But discussion went on. At the annual conference of the Catholic Confederation of England and Wales held at Sheffield in 1921, a resolution was proposed by the National Executive Council declaring that a Catholic could not be a Socialist, and that the Labour Party became a Socialist Party in 1918, and urging Catholic Trade Unionists to refuse payment of the parliamentary levy and oppose the affiliation of their trade unions to the Labour Party and Socialist International. Mr. Thomas Burns, the mover of the resolution, complained that Catholic

Trade Unionists had been tricked into Socialism through their unions becoming affiliated to the Labour Party. The chairman, who thought it harmful to force this issue lest the Catholic workman think that the Church was trying to drive him out of the Labour Party, moved an amendment that the matter be referred back for further consideration. When put to a vote, this amendment was lost, and the resolution went through by an overwhelming majority. As can be realised by recalling what had been said by the Bishop of Northampton and the Archbishop of Liverpool two years before, the action of this Catholic organisation had no authoritative force, but reflected the private opinion of one group, in no way representative and drawn from but a few dioceses.⁸⁸

Though they represented nobody but themselves, their pronouncement was received as the "vox ecclesiae" by the secular press and their private opinions imputed to the whole Catholic body in England. Mr. Somerville found it necessary to write a corrective to this unfortunate impression in the pages of the *Christian Democrat*. He quoted the offending clause of the new constitution of the Labour Party. One of its declared aims was "To secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service." The words, "upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production" were, on the face of them, Socialistic. Yet, two important facts served to modify their meaning. Mr. Webb in his *New Constitution of the Labour Party* had explained that the expression "common ownership" was in effect simply a repudiation of individualism. In the second place, the same constitution of 1918 had stipulated that the Party's candidates should appear before their constituencies as "Labour Candidates," not "Socialist Candidates" or even "Labour and Socialist Candidates."⁸⁹

Archbishop Whiteside had mentioned the fact that the question of Catholic relations to the Labour Party had been referred to

Rome for adjudication. Two years later there came the Sheffield affair, but the authorities had not spoken. When representation had been made to Rome regarding Catholics belonging to the Party, several reports were written by prominent men bearing on the subject. The view generally put forward was that the Party was a political organisation; and that though some of its members might be Socialists in the full sense of the term, persons voting with the Party were not thereby committed to "Socialistic" views or pledged to "Socialistic" legislation. Other political parties might contain a number of supporters—perhaps a majority—favourable to measures, divorce, for example, which Catholics condemned. But this viewpoint did not bind the Catholic contingency.⁹⁰

The Labour Party Conference held in London in 1923 passed a resolution inspired by the I.L.P. to the effect that the Party's supreme object was the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth. A Catholic writer in a commentary on this action, pointed out that it did not pledge non-Socialist members, such as Catholics—and Mr. J. H. Thomas!—to any special course of action. It had no practical significance. The two most advanced planks in the Labour platform were the capital levy for debt redemption and the nationalisation of certain large industries. There was nothing in these to which a Catholic, as a Catholic, could object.⁹¹

Early in 1924, the people of Great Britain passed under the rule of a Labour Government for the first time in history. Catholics were represented not only among the rank and file of the M.P.'s, but in Mr. Macdonald's Cabinet, John Wheatley, a Catholic, being Minister of Health. Mr. Wheatley was, like his Chief, a self-educated worker and had played a prominent part in the Labour politics of both Scotland and England. Catholics were satisfied with their own position in the Party and could point with pride to the religious connections of their non-Catholic colleagues, whose devotion to their own churches gave the lie to those who said that English Labour was irreligious.⁹²

In August of that year there occurred the much translated and

widely quoted interview that Cardinal Bourne gave at Amsterdam to a Dutch paper, *De Tijd*. The language used was French; and the following excerpt is taken from a literal translation of the French version which appeared in the November first issue of *Les Nouvelles Religieuses*:

"The journalist having remarked that among the members of the Labour Party there are Socialists, the Cardinal replied with a smile: 'I assure you for certain that our Labour Party has nothing in its programme which threatens religion. Certainly there are some extremists among its members but as a party it has nothing in common with the Socialists of the Continent . . . Mr. Macdonald is neither materialist nor Marxist; one can say as much of the principal Labour men.'

"The Cardinal added that, without recognising it, the party approached in certain respects to Catholic social doctrine."⁹³

Before the end of the year, the other parties combined to overthrow the Labour Government. The pretext was a political interference with the course of justice, but the cause was the party's alleged subservience to communistic influences, both foreign and domestic. The Jesuit periodical, the *Month*, deplored this attempt to identify the Labour Government with Bolshevism and pointed out that only two days before the defeat of the Government the Party at the Labour Conference had refused to admit Communists to a part in its organisation and activities. The workers had reason to be proud of their Labour ministry and the Party had profited immeasurably by its experience in office-holding. As to its supposed Socialistic leanings: . . . "So long as the right to own and enjoy property is recognised, encouraged and protected, the root-principle of Socialism is denied. . . . We imagine that there are few genuine Socialists amongst the leaders of the Labour Party, and probably none, if they thought clearly amongst the rank and file. . . . If we are tending towards Socialism, we have to thank for that fact the concentration of wealth in the hands of a comparatively few, due to the prevalence of various forms of usury. Unreformed, undisciplined, un-Christianised Capitalism is bringing about its own doom."⁹⁴

No special consideration has been given to Catholic relations with the Unionist and Liberal Parties. Unlike the Labour Party they were not organised for professedly economic ends, although it is not by accident that great Catholic landowners find a place of refreshment, light and peace in the Conservative fold. Moreover, Catholics of other views have found a temporary alliance with Conservatives of great protection whenever the interests of religious education were at stake. English Catholicism has given a smaller proportion of its members to Liberalism than to either Conservatism or Labour. Those of Irish extraction and sympathies were attracted to the party of Gladstone, Asquith and Lloyd George because of the hope that it held out for a settlement of the Irish question on the basis of local autonomy. With that issue out of the way, such people feel free to turn their attention to industrial issues and for that purpose have tied up their political destinies with Labour.⁹⁵

WHY NOT A CATHOLIC POLITICAL PARTY ?

Why has not a Catholic political party been formed in Great Britain? There are, to be sure, arguments in favour of such a course. Some communities and groups of people are dominated by the idea that the first thing to do is to pass a law, and an organisation responsible for reforms expressed in legislation has something definite to which to point in testimony of constructive achievement. The work of the English Catholics is less easily appraised.

But would it be advisable for them to change their accustomed course? Catholic political parties exist on the Continent of Europe. Among the most famous was that child of the *Kulturkampf*, the Center Party of Germany, which grew into prominence under the able leadership of Windthorst, and since the War has given, in conjunction with the Social Democracy, several conspicuous leaders to the German Commonwealth. There is in France the *Action Libérale*, originating rather as a gesture than a defence, less decidedly political than the Center but character-

ised like it by an interesting programme of social reform, inspired in this case by Count Albert de Mun. Holland boasts a Catholic Party which forms the nucleus of a conservative "blok"; the unfortunate little remnant of the once powerful Austro-Hungarian Empire owes whatever improvement has come about in its desperate economic status to the indefatigable leadership of a public-spirited priest; and it is not unlikely that many people looked to the Popular Party of Italy under the captaincy of Don Sturzo to place a barrier in the way of what has proved to be the successful onward march of black-shirted Fascismo.⁹⁶

Why, then, have not English Catholics seen fit to transplant, as it were, this custom to their soil? Why do they not even yet foster there a Catholic Party? Before quoting one or two opinions on this subject, it might be well to point out certain conditions in England which differ from those obtaining elsewhere. For one thing, Catholics in English speaking countries form so small a minority of the population that under the two-party system which normally characterises English practice their collective effectiveness would be seriously impaired. The number of Catholics in Parliament might actually diminish, because, unless a system of proportional representation saved the day, so few would be the number of Catholic voters that the Catholic candidate would be swamped in a three-cornered contest.

If Catholics should draw up a programme like that of the British Labour Party could they marshal as many votes? As members of a confessional party they would find that their religious label had rendered them suspect. They would alienate many people favourable to their social programme but unfriendly to the Catholic Church. Nor would the difficulty end here. On mooted questions like tariff reform versus free trade what kind of plank should they put in their platform? As a political party they could scarcely dodge the issue and a pronouncement upon it would divide their own following. Even as regards subjects falling within the scope of the social question, it might be impossible or inexpedient to take sides. When Poor Law Reform agitated Britain, some Catholics were to be found in *The National*

Poor Law Reform Association formed to work for the acceptance of the Majority Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law; others supported the findings of the Minority. It is not impossible that a Catholic Political Party might have been called upon to uphold one or the other of these policies.

In 1902 under the Balfour Government Catholics received state support for their schools. Four years later, the Liberals, then in power, attempted through a series of educational bills to undo the work of 1902. The Catholics of Great Britain, aided at political risk by the Irish members of Parliament, put up a united opposition to these efforts. Consolidated by this single issue, they defeated the aims of their opponents. Never before—nor since—have they shown such a spirit of union. Then was the time to get up a political party of their own had they felt the need of such a step. It is significant that they were able to meet that crisis successfully without recourse to so radical a departure.⁹⁷

On the Continent a Catholic party generally answers to a larger constituency, and, taking advantage of the multiplicity of political groups and the resultant bloc system, can readily combine with elements possessing similar aims in a coalition backing desired legislation. Moreover, the Catholic political parties of continental Europe have usually come into being as a defensive manoeuvre against anti-Catholic political activity such as that which characterised the administration of Bismarck before the exigencies of domestic diplomacy led him to play off the Black International against the Red. In England, on the contrary, Catholicism is not so intimately bound up with political institutions that people have felt constrained to take up a clear political position for or against it—nor is their psychology so logical (or so extreme). Since the era of Catholic Emancipation, moreover, nothing has occurred to warrant Catholics assembling themselves for political or social action in a self-conscious compact group. St. George Mivart in 1883 summed up the English situation so admirably that rather extensive quotation will not be out of place. Answering the question, what is the political duty of Catholics here and now? he wrote:

"Their duty is to vote according to their conviction as individual citizens, and not at all *as Catholics* for in England there is not and cannot be a Catholic party; not on account of the smallness of our numbers, but on account of the just and even-handed treatment which we receive from our fellow countrymen, and the glorious liberty which we enjoy as English citizens. England affords a noble example to the whole world, and wherever Catholics are as free and unoppressed as they are here, there neither is nor can be a Catholic party. The duty of all churchmen, to whichever political party they belong, is to do their very best to purge that party of those anti-theistic and anti-social elements which exist amongst their political associates, and such elements exist amongst both Conservatives and Liberals. But let no Catholic, *as a Catholic*, presume to blame another for adhering to either party according to his political judgment.

"... A greater injury can hardly be done at once to the nation and to religion than the attempt to create a religious political party where such a party is not forced into existence (as in Belgium) by acts of oppression and incipient persecution. With the progress of political evolution, and as the diffusion of justice and a due regard for the inalienable rights of the individual citizen, reposing on ethics, extends itself over the world there will be less and less need of a 'Catholic party' anywhere. ... With the progress of evolution the distinctness of the spheres of just political and true religious activity will become more and more apparent, and therewith will cease one great cause of antagonism to the Christian Church."⁹⁸

As to the value of a Catholic party in registering a protest against radical economic views and embodying a social programme, it must be remembered that in continental Europe Socialism has not only assumed more extreme forms than elsewhere but has frequently shown an irreligious animus and pursued an anti-clerical policy, thus stimulating Catholics to array themselves against organised antipathy—which, however, has not been always unprovoked. These conditions as we have seen are not duplicated in England to any appreciable degree. The Sidney Webbs and

Bernard Shaw seem safely committed to the theory that the pen is mightier than the bomb; even the left wing of the Labour Party, denounced as "Bolshevist" in the khaki election of 1918 because of its defeatist policy during the War, was led by the eminently respectable and conspicuously Christian Ramsay MacDonald; and it would not be easy to imagine Mr. Arthur Henderson with his nonconformist affiliations indulging in such anti-religious tirades as punctuated the fervid oratory of the late M. Viviani.

Mr. E. Randolph in an article originally appearing in the *Catholic Union Gazette* in 1882 called upon his fellow-Catholics to claim their proper share in the business of the nation, the borough and the parish "whether we happen to be among the supporters of her Majesty's Government or her Majesty's Opposition." Evidently the idea of a Catholic political party did not occur to him. Other English Catholics, however, have seriously entertained the notion.

At the Birmingham Congress in the summer of 1923, Mr. Thomas F. Burns, the organising secretary of the Catholic Confederation of England and Wales, mentioned three ways by which Catholic representation might be secured in Parliament, i.e. the formation of a political party which while not a distinctively "Catholic Party" would nevertheless be in harmony with Catholic principles; through Catholics working inside the existing political parties; and through Catholics standing as "Independents." The first method he dismissed, for the time being at least, as impracticable.⁹⁹

Cardinal Bourne, who in a discourse delivered in the same city on January 22, 1907, had opposed the organisation by Catholics of a party of their own in view of their small numbers, the very few questions on which they could show a united policy, and the meagerness of their funds, again deprecated the formation of a Catholic Party. He pointed with satisfaction to the unprecedented number of Catholics in the House of Commons, and rejoiced in their presence there, less because it might further Catholic interests than because it was a manifestation of the con-

cern which Catholics as citizens were taking in the affairs of their country and also because it gave an opportunity for the expression of the Catholic position with regard to certain types of legislation which owed their origin rather to ignorance of Catholic ideals than malicious opposition to them. But a Catholic party would be likely to make mistakes for which the Church would be blamed. The profession of the Catholic faith did not imply a common outlook in political affairs.¹⁰⁰

The Catholic Young Men's Society at its Chester Conference in June, 1924, defeated a suggestion that a Catholic political party be formed in England. Mr. Addly of Edinburgh read a paper on "The Catholic Young Men's Society and Party Politics." In his address he recalled the Sheffield episode and said that it emphasised the danger of a Catholic society's interfering in political matters. There was danger that outsiders would identify the views of the society with those of the Church. In the discussion that followed, Mr. McLaughlin, delegate from Glasgow, said that the sooner they had a Catholic Party the better. Dr. Colvin, the president of the association, opposed this idea, his chief objection being that they would have to change human nature before they could unite all Catholics on political questions. Continued discussion revealed a general trend against the formation of a Catholic Party, but in favour of the study of social problems with careful avoidance of party politics.

At the final meeting of the Conference, a resolution was passed to the effect that whilst adhering to the rule regarding exclusion from party politics, every member should be an ardent politician and seek to permeate his party with the principles of Catholic social reform.¹⁰¹

When English Catholics have laid the spectre of a Catholic political party, they have not done with tantalizing problems connected with their attitude toward social questions. There is, for example, the problem as to whether religious leaders should intervene in specific economic disputes and speak with authority on social questions. And there is the further issue—like unto the first—as to whether English Catholics, clerical and lay, banded

together for the study of social questions should attempt by definite pronouncements to commit their coreligionists to a clear-cut social policy, or content themselves with the declaration of general principles. In the absence of a Catholic party, should there be a Catholic programme? Or should the individual Catholic, with a mind trained in a knowledge of social problems and a conscience enlightened by the enunciation of Catholic principles, be left to the guidance of his own judgment as to the merits of each specific problem as it presents itself for solution?

All these are mooted questions and they have faced the Catholic Social Guild which is obliged to steer a perilous course between the Scylla of an inflexible and arbitrarily imposed Catholic programme, destructive of personal liberty and likely to lead to the unwanted Catholic party, and the Charybdis of platitudes, powerless alike to stir up qualms in the individual conscience and to inspire to action the individual will. The Catholic Social Guild, to the story of which we shall devote most of the next two chapters, has been accused of being too definite and of not being definite enough. This interesting phase of its history—and through it of the history of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain—will find its appropriate place in the pages that follow.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Macdonald, J. R., *The Socialist Movement* (New York, 1911), p. 195.

² *Ibid.*, p. xi.

³ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, article *Socialism*, Vol. xiv.

⁴ On the eve of the revolution of 1848, Marx and Engels proclaimed the principles of the new cosmopolitan Socialism in their *Communist Manifesto*. While in exile in England, Marx wrote *Das Kapital*, the famous exposition of scientific Socialism known as the "working-man's Bible."

⁵ Larkin, W. P., *Marxian Socialism* (London, 1918), p. ii; Carpenter, N., *Guild-Socialism* (New York, 1922), pp. 17, 18.

⁶ Menger, A., *The Right to the Whole Produce of Labour* (London, 1899), p. 101. Menger in placing Godwin at the head of the English Socialist School wrote: "Godwin may be regarded as the first scientific Socialist of modern times, in whom are to be found in germ all the ideas of modern socialism and anarchism."

William Thompson, an Irishman by birth, published in 1824, *An Inquiry*

into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness. The following quotations are taken from a later edition by Pare (London, 1850): "Without labour, there is no wealth. Labour is its distinguishing attribute. The agency of nature constitutes nothing an object of wealth. Labour is the sole parent of wealth." (p. 6) "... in any given state of society, with any given desires, at any particular time, labour employed with ordinary judgment on objects of desire, is the sole measure of their values; and under such circumstances, an accurate measure." (p. 14)

Others have accepted Menger's viewpoint as to Marxian origins. Mr. R. H. Tawney, for example, in his introduction to Beer's *History of British Socialism* declared that "the writings of Gray, Thompson, Hodgskin and Bray . . . laid down the main lines of Socialist thought more than twenty years before the appearance of the Communist Manifesto." Beer, M., *History of British Socialism*, 2 vols. (London, 1919), Vol. I, p. xviii. In 1911, Esther Lowenthal analysed the theories of Thompson, Gray, Hodgskin and Bray in a study edited by the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University, entitled *Ricardian Socialists*.

⁷ An interesting insight into the ease with which Englishmen are prone to label really moderate measures as Socialistic can be gained by reference to Dicey's *Lectures on The Relation Between Law and Opinion in England During the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1914). In a lecture devoted to "The Growth of Collectivism," he says "The factory movement introduced socialistic enactments into the law of England and gave prestige and authority to the ideas of collectivism" (p. 238). This reflection on social legislation occurs in a chapter headed, "Tory Philanthropy and the Factory Movement" (pp. 220-240).

Even the War failed to shake the essential conservatism of the working class movement in England. Mr. Gundlach, an American business man who headed a commission that had gone abroad after the armistice to study especially British relations of capital and labour, reported that—"even those who are theoretical Marxians—are by temperament wholly opposed to any violent change. They have been too long controlled by a Parliamentary system." *New York Times*, April 6, 1919.

⁸ Trotsky, L., *Whither England?* (New York, 1925), pp. 63, 64, 65.

⁹ Trotsky, L., *Where is Britain Going?* (London, 1925), pp. 41, 42.

¹⁰ *New York Evening Mail*, June 1, 1918.

¹¹ Belloc, H., *The Catholic Church and the Principle of Private Property* (London, 1925). Property itself, theologians have taught, is a natural right. Its division into private property, they claim, is lawful but not obligatory. Nevertheless, considering the cupidity of human nature and the lessons of history, private property is a social, if not a moral, necessity. Should conditions so change as to deprive these pragmatic arguments of their force, or should Socialists make clear their opposition not to private property *as such* but to private property as it exists in its present form, Catholics and Socialists might find themselves not so far apart. But the former will always repudiate the epigram, "La Propriété c'est le vol." Jarrett, Bede, *Mediaeval Socialism* (London, 1913), pp. 41-55; *Idem*, *Social*

Theories of the Middle Ages (London, 1926), pp. 122-149; Ross, J. E., *Christian Ethics* (New York, 1919), pp. 275-280.

¹² *Christian Democrat*, Dec., 1921, pp. 1-8; Parkinson, (edit), *The Pope and the People* (London, 1920), for Leo XIII's Encyclical of 1878; "Hence it is clear that the main tenet of Socialism, community of goods, must be utterly rejected," *Ibid.*, p. 186.

¹³ Here is a typical statement from an English Catholic source: "She (the Church) maintains (I am not speaking here of her Divine authority or of her claim to speak with the voice of Divine revelation, but only of her judgment upon the nature of men)—she maintains, I say, that human society is fulfilling the end of its being, is normal to itself, is therefore happier, when its constituent families own and privately control material things; and she further maintains . . . that this institution of ownership is not merely a civil accident . . . nor a thing deliberately set up by man . . . but a prior thing, created with man himself, inseparable from him, and close in touch with the sense of right and wrong. . . ." Belloc, H., *The Church and Socialism* (London, 1921), pp. 7-8. A well-known treatise on Socialism from the Catholic standpoint was the work of a German Jesuit, V. Cathrein. His book, *Socialism: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Application*, first appeared in 1890, passed through numerous editions and was translated into many languages. Much of it is now out of date. Cf. Schäffle, A., *Quintessence of Socialism* (New York, 1880).

¹⁴ *Tablet*, Oct. 9, 1875; *Ibid.*, Nov. 17, 1906.

¹⁵ Devas, C. S., *Key to the World's Progress* (London, 1912), p. 63.

¹⁶ *Economic Journal*, Vol. 16 (1906), pp. 637, 638.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 8 (1898), pp. 28-36.

¹⁸ Devas, C. S., *Labour and Capital in England From the Catholic Point of View* (London, 1876).

¹⁹ *Idem*, *Statistical Aspect of Wealth and Welfare* (Manchester).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 86. When speaking of the disproportionate growth of towns which may have produced a disproportionate growth of unhappiness, he gave his views as to the oscillatory character of evolution: "Certainly it seems highly significant that, step by step with the marvellous mechanical inventions of the ages and all we call material progress, this sinister concentration of men has advanced; and, if not actually caused by the inventions, has been rendered possible by them. The cup of terrestrial felicity seems dashed once more from our lips; the golden age again lingers in its coming; and those seem to have the best of the argument who argue, with an appeal to the history of a hundred civilisations, that evolution is no simple progress, but much rather a complicated intertwining of oscillation of progress and regress, growth and decay, integration and disintegration, weaving and unravelling of what has been woven, movement towards cosmos and movement towards chaos." (pp. 83, 84.)

²¹ Devas, C. S., *Key to the World's Progress* (London, 1912), p. 153.

²² *Idem*, *Groundwork of Economics* (London, 1883), pp. 405, 406.

²³ *Idem.*, *Social Questions and the Duty of Catholics*, p. 82. The essay from which this quotation is taken—"Is Socialism Right After All?" first appeared in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. 139 (1906), p. 321 *et seq.*

²⁴ *Idem, op. cit.*, pp. 83-85.

²⁵ *Idem, op. cit., passim.*

²⁶ *Catholic Mind*, Vol. 6 (1908), p. 155. This discourse was originally printed in pamphlet form by the Scottish Society, but went out of print. It was later reprinted by permission. Devas had already treated the subject for the Scottish Society; but it was held that its importance justified his writing a second pamphlet somewhat differently treated: *Catholic Book Notes*, Jan. 15, 1908, pp. 25, 26. The source used here is the reprint which appeared in the *Catholic Mind* in 1908.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 174.

²⁸ *Tablet*, Mar. 24, 1888, p. 473; *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1908, p. 411; *Manchester Catholic Herald*, Aug. 22, 1908 (quoted in the *Catholic Fortnightly Review*), Vol. 15 (1908), pp. 728, 729.

²⁹ *Times*, Sept. 11, 1907; *Month*, Vol. iii (1908), pp. 36-51.

³⁰ *Socialist Review*, Vol. ii (1908-9), p. 570. Archibald J. Dunn writing in the *Tablet* for Aug. 24, 1907, proposed a scheme for Catholic village settlements in accordance with the Small Holdings Act. After suggesting that the allotments could be grouped around a monastery or convent, he declared that just as the religious orders had once saved civilisation from the attacks of the barbarians, so they could now establish "an additional claim to the gratitude of the world if they could save it again from the twentieth century barbarians—the Socialists." The eyes of the editor of the *Socialist Review* may have fallen upon such expressions of opinion.

³¹ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 147 (1910), p. 374.

³² *Catholicism and Socialism* (London, 1911), Rickaby, J. M., *Socialism*.

³³ *Ibid.*, Ashton, J., *Socialism and Religion*.

³⁴ Vaughan, V., *Socialism from the Christian Standpoint* (New York, 1912), *passim*.

³⁵ Day, H., *Catholic Democracy: Individualism and Socialism* (London, 1914).

³⁶ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1914, pp. 97-101; *Studies*, Vol. 2 (1913), pp. 369, 383.

³⁷ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 155 (1914), pp. 101-115. Mr. Somerville deprecated the nature of certain of the current attacks on Socialism. He saw nothing to be gained by luridly painting the system as conducive to atheism and congenial to free love. Devas, it will be recalled, had a similar viewpoint; and Mr. Belloc after defining the economic policy of Socialism added: "That is the only exclusive meaning of Socialism. All the other wobbly ideas that have been tacked on to it by its enemies or its friends—that it is 'atheistic,' or that it involves sexual 'immorality,' that it is 'progressive,' that it is 'Christian'—have nothing to do with the one proposition which alone distinguishes it from other policies." Belloc, H., *An Examination of Socialism* (London, 1908), p. 1.

³⁸ *A Report Upon the Catholic Social Guild's Publications: Their Teaching and Their Tendency* (London, 1914).

³⁹ *Tablet*, July 18, 1914.

⁴⁰ *New York Evening Mail*, June 1, 1918.

⁴¹ *Christian Democrat*, March, 1923, pp. 1-3.

⁴² *Studies*, Vol. 12 (1923), p. 581.

⁴³ *New Age*, May 2, 1908. It is significant that Mr. and Mrs. Webb called one of their best known books *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization*. Leon Trotsky has used a phrase which shows that he too takes this condition for granted: ". . . in the present state of England's obvious economic decline." *Whither England?* p. 66. Where the evolution of capitalism and the urbanisation of society are as yet incomplete—in the United States of America, for example,—few people are to be found who either hail or fear the collapse of our industrial civilisation.

A group of laymen, who have set up St. Dominic's press in England where conditions of industry inspired by the Middle Ages find their place, share the convictions of the Distributivists. The artist, Eric Gill, one of their members once said: "Christ wept over Jerusalem. But he chose to live and work in the country." Selected to execute the Leeds University war memorial, in a frieze at the base he drew a representation of Christ driving the money-changers from the temple. The money-changers wore the head-gear of modern business men and on the base was a text in Latin, denouncing the rich. *Commonweal*, Dec. 23, 1925.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, Oct. 28, 1925. An entertaining satire on the collusion between big business and politics is to be found in Belloc's novel, *Emmanuel Burden, Merchant of Thames St., in the city of London, exporter of hardware*. (New York, 1904.) Belloc, H., *The Catholic Church and the Principle of Private Property* (London, 1925), p. 17; *Idem*, *An Examination of Socialism* (London, 1908), p. 16; *Idem*, *The Church and Socialism* (London, 1921), p. 10; *Idem*, *Catholic Social Reform vs. Socialism* (London, 1922), p. 7. Mr. Belloc has shown his accustomed preference for the peasant over the townee in his *Companion to Mr. Wells's "Outline of History"* (London, 1926), pp. 52, 53. *New Age*, May 2, 1908; Belloc, H., *The Servile State* (London, 1912). Writing in 1911, Cecil Chesterton alluded to "The Bill now before Parliament called, as I am informed, 'A Bill for the Reduction of the Working Classes of Great Britain to a Condition or Chattel Slavery' (short title, 'National Insurance Bill')," *New Age*, Aug. 17, 1911.

⁴⁵ Chesterton, G. K., *The New Jerusalem* (New York, 1921), pp. 17, 18.

⁴⁶ *Hearst's International*, Vol. 41 (1922), p. 86.

⁴⁷ *G. K.'s Weekly*, Aug. 15, 1925.

⁴⁸ *Catholic World*, Vol. 110 (1920), p. 470. This article, "The Evil of Poverty" (pp. 464-470), is offered as a refutation of statements made by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., in the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1915 under the caption "Poverty as a National Asset."

⁴⁹ An excellent sample of the religious enthusiasm with which Father McNabb approaches the land question is to be found in Ch. xi of his *From a Friar's Cell* (New York, 1923).

⁵⁰ McNabb, V., *The Church and the Land* (London, 1926), *passim*. In 1913 a Catholic Oxford man who called himself Christopher Holdenby wrote a book in which he narrated his experiences as an agricultural labourer in the south and the west of England. This study, *Folk of the Furrow* (London, 1913), to which Sir. Horace Plunkett wrote the intro-

duction, gives an intimate and sympathetic picture of the English country folk.

⁶¹ *G. K's Weekly*, June 6, 1925. In the article on Socialism which he prepared for the thirteenth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, George Bernard Shaw used the expression "distributive state" as synonymous with the Socialist state: *New York Times*, September 12, 1926. Such, needless to say, is not its connotation in the foregoing section.

⁶² Cole, G. D. H., *Self-Government in Industry* (London, 1917); *Idem*, *Guild Socialism* (New York, 1920); Penty, A. J., *A Guildsman's Interpretation of History* (New York, 1920); *Idem*, *Post-Industrialism* (London, 1922); *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1914, pp. 102, 103. Hobson, Orage, Penty, Cole and Carpenter are all non-Catholics.

Penty in his author's preface to *Post-Industrialism* mentions Dr. Austin Freeman's *Social Decay and Regeneration* and Dean Inge's review in the *Edinburgh* for July, 1921, in support of his thesis that the unrestricted use of machinery is followed everywhere by a decline in physical and mental efficiency. He points out that Beer's *History of British Socialism* shows that the Socialist movement had its origin in an attempt to solve the problem of men and machines, and that the problems connected with machinery played a very prominent part in Socialist thought from Owen to Marx.

⁶³ Was Syndicalism, Guild Socialism or Bolshevism—or perhaps an ingredient common to them all—foreshadowed by *The Crisis*, an organ of the English proletariat, in its issue of April 12th, 1834 when it printed the following words? "We shall have a real House of Commons. We have never yet had a House of Commons. The only House of Commons is a House of Trades, and that is only just beginning to be formed. We shall have a new set of boroughs when the unions are organised; every trade shall be a borough, and every trade shall have a council of representatives to conduct its affairs. Our present commoners know nothing of the interests of the people, and care not for them. They are all landholders. How can an employer represent a workman? There are 133,000 shoemakers in the country, yet not one representative have they in the House of Commons. According to the proportion they bear to the population they ought to have twenty-five representatives. . . . The character of the Reformed Parliament is now blasted. . . . It will be substituted by a House of Trades." Beer, M., *History of British Socialism*, 2 vols. (London, 1919), Vol. i, p. 339.

⁶⁴ Carpenter, N., *Guild Socialism* (New York, 1922), pp. 147-149, pp. 183-190.

⁶⁵ Douglas, C. H., *Economic Democracy* (London, 1919); Douglas, C. H., and Orage, A. R., *Credit Power and Democracy* (London, 1920); Carpenter, N., *op. cit.*, pp. 218-229; *Commonweal*, Feb. 17, 1926; *Ibid.*, April 14, 1926; *Ibid.*, April 21, 1926; *Ibid.*, April 28, 1926; *Ibid.*, May 26, 1926. This last is an adverse criticism of the scheme.

⁶⁶ *New Age*, May-August, 1911, *passim*; *Commonweal*, Nov. 26, 1924, pp. 75, 76. Mr. Orage objects to the exclusiveness of the Labour Party, in

so far as it makes its appeal to a single class—the wage-earners or proletariat; *Ibid.*, Feb. 10, 1926.

⁵⁷ *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, Aug. 1910 (Vol. 3-4), p. 100.

⁵⁸ *New York Globe and Commercial Advertiser*, January 7, 1921; Bechhofer, C., and Reckitt, M., *Meaning of National Guilds* (London, 1918), pp. 266, 269, 274.

⁵⁹ Penty, A., *Post-Industrialism* (London, 1922), pp. 7-10.

⁶⁰ Cole, G. D. H., *Guild Socialism Re-stated* (London, 1920), pp. 29, 30; Bechhofer, C. and Reckitt, M., *op. cit.*, p. xiv, p. 268.

⁶¹ *New Age*, Oct. 2, 9, 16, 30, 1913; *Ibid.*, Nov. 6, 13, 27 and Dec. 4, 1913; Mann, J. E. F., Sievers, N. J. and Cox, R. W. T., *The Real Democracy* (Longmans, 1913), p. viii, p. ix, pp. 125-132.

⁶² *New Age*, Dec. 11, 1913; Bechhofer & Reckitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 407-414.

⁶³ Goldwell, F., *Guild Socialism: A Criticism of the National Guild Theory* (London, 1918), *passim*.

⁶⁴ *Commonweal*, Feb. 10, 1926.

⁶⁵ *Christian Democrat*, Vol. 4 (1924), p. 164; Rickaby, J., *Moral Philosophy* (London, 1923), p. 283. For a distinction between Socialism and Communism see Devas, *Political Economy* (London, 1892), p. 479.

⁶⁶ *Christian Democrat*, Vol. i, Oct. 1921; Parkinson, H. (edit.), *The Pope and the People* (London, 1920), p. 186.

⁶⁷ Watt, L., *Modern Communism* (London, 1926); *Commonweal*, May 19, 1926, pp. 37, 38. For a communist comment on the attitude of the Labour Party see *Communist Review*, Vol. 4 (1923), p. 149 *et seq.*; *Revue de Paris*, Vol. 6 (1924), pp. 893-905.

⁶⁸ *Christian Democrat*, Vol. 4 (1924), pp. 164-166; Watt, L., *Catholics and Communism* (Oxford, 1925); *Idem*, *Capitalism, Communism, Catholicism* (Oxford, 1926), *Idem*, *Modern Communism* (London, 1926).

⁶⁹ *Times*, June 1, 1925; *Tablet*, June 6, 1925; *Catholic Times*, June 6, 13, 1925.

⁷⁰ Somerville, H., *Trade Unionism* (London, 1921); *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, Vol. ii, Aug. 1909, p. 10; *Tablet*, Sept. 22, 1883.

⁷¹ Cross, A. L., *A Shorter History of England and Greater Britain* (New York, 1920), pp. 748, 749; Cheyney, E. P., *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England* (New York, 1923), pp. 349-352; Slater, G., *The Making of Modern England* (Boston, 1920), pp. 262-267.

⁷² Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 877-879.

⁷³ *New Republic*, Feb. 16, 1918, part ii, p. 3.

⁷⁴ At the same time, the Secretary of the Party, Arthur Henderson issued in its name, a book entitled *The Aims of Labour* (New York, 1918), which further expressed the new viewpoint of his confrères.

⁷⁵ *Labour Year Book*, 1919, p. 3.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21; Webb, S. & B., *History of Trade Unionism* (London, 1920), p. 697.

⁷⁷ Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 881, 882; *New York Evening Mail*, Dec. 2, 1918; *New York World*, Dec. 8, 1918; *Ibid.*, Dec. 23, 1918.

⁷⁸ *New Republic*, Dec. 19, 1923. For an account of the phenomenal growth of the Labour Party in membership and Parliamentary representa-

tion, consult Webb, S., *Labour Party on the Threshold* (London, 1923), pp. 3, 4.

⁷⁹ Macdonald, J. R., *The Socialist Movement* (New York, 1911), p. 235.

⁸⁰ *America*, Dec. 15, 1923.

⁸¹ Carpenter, N., *op. cit.*, pp. 67-74; Beer, M., *History of British Socialism*, 2 vols. (London, 1921), Vol. ii, pp. 327-334.

⁸² Beer, *op. cit.*, pp. 372, 376; pp. 395-400.

⁸³ *Tablet*, Feb. 1, 1908; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, pp. 86, 87; Waninger, K., *Social Catholicism in England* (St. Louis, 1923), pp. 182, 184; *Catholic Social Guild Leaflet*, No. i, p. 3; *Universe*, Oct. 11, 1918.

⁸⁴ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, pp. 83-90.

⁸⁵ *Christian Democrat*, Vol. 4 (1924), p. 18; *Month*, vol. 131 (1918), pp. 209-220.

⁸⁶ *Universe*, Nov. 22, 1918; Webb, S., *New Constitution of the Labour Party* (London, 1918).

⁸⁷ Somerville, H., *Why the Church has Condemned Socialism* (Oxford, 1922), pp. 14, 15.

⁸⁸ *Christian Democrat*, Nov. 1921, p. 2; *Times*, Oct. 4, 1921; Somerville, *loc. cit.*

⁸⁹ *Christian Democrat*, Nov., 1921, pp. 1-3.

⁹⁰ According to Joseph Clayton, the presence of Catholics, especially Irish Catholics, has been a potent influence in keeping the British Labour Movement from taking on anti-clerical and anti-Christian aspects, *Studies*, vol. 14 (1925), pp. 287, 291; *Catholic Times and Catholic Opinion*, June 25, 1926. Mr. Clayton in his recent book, *The Rise and Decline of Socialism in Great Britain, 1884-1924* (London, 1926) attributes the opposition of Catholic clergy in England towards the earlier Socialism to fear lest activity in Labour politics might withdraw people from the cause of "Home Rule" which was upheld by the Liberal Party. It is perhaps more likely that their opposition was due to the more radical nature of early British Socialism. Otherwise, why were not Catholic members of the Conservative Party denounced?

⁹¹ *Christian Democrat*, Aug., 1923, pp. 1-4.

⁹² *Brooklyn Tablet*, Mar. 22, 1924; *Catholic News* (New York), Mar. 1, 1924.

⁹³ *Universe*, Nov. 14, 1924. An earlier report had appeared in the same paper on Aug. 22, 1924.

In an article written by Father Keating for the *Month* of December of that year, the author expressed the hope that the Party in power would kill Socialism by kindness, that is by bringing about the reformation of Capitalism.

⁹⁴ *Month*, Vol. 144 (1924), pp. 448-453. But when the editors discovered that the Report on Russia made by delegates of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress was a whitewashing of the Bolsheviks they began to feel that there was perhaps a radical element weakening the Party. *Ibid.*, Vol. 145 (1925), pp. 79, 172, 173.

⁹⁵ *Commonweal*, June 23, 1926; *Studies*, Vol. 14 (1925), pp. 284-294; *Catholic Times*, June 25, 1926. In this article Mr. Joseph Clayton works

out the provocative thesis that Irish Catholic influence has been a potent factor in keeping English labour from going off at irreligious tangents. Mr. Somerville in the April, 1926, number of the *Christian Democrat* discussed "The Catholic Worker and Political Parties." He gave an illuminating picture of the chaos that is English Socialism, and took up among other questions, that of the relations between Catholics and the I. L. P. For an outline of the career of James Sexton, one of the best known of the Irish-English labour men see the *Catholic Who's Who and Year Book* (London, 1926), p. 437.

⁹⁶ *America*, Oct. 7, 1922. In 1919, the Netherlands Government sent Monsignor Dr. W. H. Nolens as its representative to the International Labour Conference at Washington. *New York Times*, Dec. 7, 1919; The work of the Christian Social Party of Austria, led by Dr. Seipel is described in the *Commonweal*, Dec. 24, 1924; Dr. Joseph Collins characterised Don Sturzo as "The New Savonarola." *New York Times*, May 7, 1922; *New York World*, Feb. 9, 1925. The leader of the Italian Popular Party made his influence felt at the Conference of Genoa, *New York Times*, April 28, 1922, *Ibid.*, May 1, 1922.

⁹⁷ *Month*, Vol. 113 (1909), pp. 381-390. For the Education Bill of 1906 see *Dublin Review*, Vol. 140 (1907), pp. 128-138.

⁹⁸ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 93 (1883), pp. 23, 24. It was known that Cardinal Manning studiously avoided party politics. Apropos of Gladstone's Home Rule Bill, he expressed his determination not to mix pastor and politician. Snead-Cox, J. G., *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, 2 vols. (London, 1910), Vol. i, p. 470. Even in Manning's day, "Many thoughtful Catholics" were "discussing the duty or the necessity, or the possibility of forming a Catholic party, political, or religious or both," *Dublin Review* 3 ser. 14 (1885), p. 401.

⁹⁹ *Tablet*, June 3, 1882.

Regarding this whole question of Catholics uniting for political or social action, an extract from the famous letter of Cardinal Gibbons to Cardinal Simeoni on the Knights of Labour may not be out of place: "But it is asked, instead of such an organisation, could there not be confraternities, in which the workingmen would be united under the direction of the clergy and the influence of religion? I answer frankly that I do not consider this either possible or necessary in our country . . . the presence and direct influence of the clergy would not be advisable where our citizens, without distinction of religious belief, come together in regard to their industrial interests alone." This condemnation of Catholic labour unions for the United States might be equally applicable to English conditions.

¹⁰⁰ *Le Correspondant*, Dec. 25, 1917. Cardinal Bourne was not impressed by the experiences of the Center Party in Germany or the Popular Party in Italy, *Times*, Aug. 6, 1923, p. 5; *America*, Aug. 25, 1923.

¹⁰¹ *Times*, June 10, 1924, *Catholic Times*, June 14, 1924; *Universe*, June 13, 1924.

CHAPTER IV

THE COMING OF THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD

VAUGHAN AND THE END OF THE CENTURY

Herbert Vaughan, the third Archbishop of Westminster, manifested a keener interest in social questions than had Wiseman, but he concerned himself less with them than had his immediate predecessor, Cardinal Manning, from whom he differed markedly in temperament. Manning, spontaneous and expansive, and detecting the absence of these traits in the then Bishop of Salford whom he jocosely called "grim and truculent," prescribed the *Critic* and *The School for Scandal* as a course of reading calculated to induce the much needed geniality of spirit. He once told Vaughan that he—Vaughan—was already a good Catholic and only needed to sit at the feet of General Booth to be a good Christian! Vaughan, in his turn, had disapproved of the Cardinal's incessant public activity, especially of his part in the famous Dock Strike; and Vaughan, unlike the former Archbishop, failed to win the whole-hearted love of the poorer classes and the unstinted coöperation of the public-spirited of other faiths. Not that he was deficient in sympathy for the suffering masses; but he lacked Manning's personal magnetism, obsessing concern for human betterment, and almost stubborn enthusiasm for worthy causes. Vaughan, to be sure, shared many of Manning's interests, but his attitude seemed only a shadowy reflection, more cautiously expressed.¹

Vaughan worked devotedly for the cause of Catholic education, but there was nothing especially distinctive in that manifestation of zeal. Interest in the Christian training of the young is characteristic of all Catholic churchmen, whatever may be their in-

difference to, or concern for, other types of social reform. When he was Superior of St. Joseph's Missionary College, he urged the continuation of the voluntary system of schools, and protested especially against the inroads that were being made upon it by the introduction of the "Conscience Clause" and "Educational Rates." He advocated a great increase in national expenditure for education, but urged that payments be made to every school, whether certified or uncertified, that should achieve results satisfactory to a Government inspector.²

Just before assuming the duties of his archiepiscopal see he asked for funds to provide for the adequate training of teachers. When he returned from Rome, after receiving the Cardinalate, he urged the interest of all in the maintenance of a public elementary system of Christian education. Vaughan never wearied of pleading this cause, and his fervour continued unabated until his death. Speaking at a meeting of Birmingham Catholics, he upheld the necessity of teaching Christianity systematically in the schools, not as a mere emotion, but as a science which, like other subjects, should be presented in a scientific manner by competent teachers. In his numerous statements from the pulpit and for the press he did not deny that the State had the right to compel all children, in the interest of the nation, to go to school, and to exact a certain standard of secular instruction in return for the receipt of public money. But the right of parents to have children instructed in whatever religion they professed, he held to be inviolate.³

Vaughan, like Manning, was interested in temperance, but his labours on behalf of that cause were fewer than Manning's and his eagerness not so pronounced. Dr. Vaughan was consecrated Bishop of Salford on October 28, 1872, and two days later he made his first public appearance at a great temperance demonstration held in Free Trade Hall. On one side of him on the platform sat the implacably abstemious Archbishop Manning, and on the other Manning's right-hand man, Father Nugent, known throughout the North of England as the "Apostle of Temperance." It was a trying moment for the new Bishop who, whilst hating

drunkenness and extolling temperance, saw no extraordinary merit in total abstinence. With exemplary courage, in view of the presence of Manning and his chief aide, Vaughan not only confessed that he was not a teetotaler, but praised what he believed to be the nutritious qualities and medicinal value of beer, wines and other liquors. Nevertheless, he soon afterwards threw the weight of his position and influence into the war against drunkenness. He organised a "Crusade of Rescue," which consisted of ordinary members and pledged members, the latter total abstainers.⁴

As time went on, he was increasingly impressed by the evil aspect of drink. In 1879 he declared that Great Britain raised and augmented its imperial revenue by an ever-increasing sale of poison, yearly destructive of thousands of bodies and souls. Early in 1890, preaching at the Church of Mount Carmel in Salford, he called attention to the pestiferous influence of the numerous drinking shops located there, more than one for every two hundred of the population, including infants.⁵

The remedy he suggested for the abuses of drink was a thinning out of the public houses, which, he held, should be stricken from the slums, and tolerated only along the great thoroughfares. He also believed that the manufacture of light lager beer must be encouraged to the detriment of stronger beverages, taxation should be piled upon these latter, and counter attractions to the drink shops, such as recreational facilities of all sorts, offered to the poor. He regarded it as unnecessary to set aside a Sunday each year for discourses upon temperance—a policy which was advocated by the National Convention for Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic—on the ground that a series of resolutions upon temperance was read out from Catholic pulpits on the first Sunday of each month.⁶

In a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* he wrote: "The drink demon lies at the bottom in every effort at social regeneration, mocking at the philanthropist and religionist alike. You may spend hundreds of thousands of pounds for refuges, shelters and colonies, but if you plant a drink shop in the midst of every

forty families, refuges, shelters and colonies will be needed for many a generation to come—there is no hope of closing institutions [workhouses, industrial schools and homes for children] as long as that corrupter and destroyer, the drink shop, is systematically established within the sight and hearing of almost every poor man's house, while perhaps the poor man's house is unfit for human habitation.”⁷ This was a far cry from the time when he had braved the ire of Manning and Nugent to praise as gifts of God the elements that went into the making of liquor, and spoke feelingly of the finished product for its value as medicine and food.

Cardinal Vaughan was aware of the low social condition of the working classes and sincerely anxious for ameliorative legislation in their behalf. He favoured improved sanitation of cities and better houses for the poor, realising the deplorable moral, as well as material, effects of deficiencies in these respects. In a letter prefacing Leo XIII's Encyclical on Saint Francis and the Propagation of the Third Order, he asked the Tertiaries to devote themselves as far as possible to the works of charity required by the present condition of society. In the *Daily Chronicle* for November 15, 1893, there appeared an article signed by the Cardinal, in which he upheld as axiomatic the principle of a fair living wage. But the application of general principles, he declared, must be left in great measure to the experience of experts and to the controlling influences of a more enlightened public opinion. At the moment of writing, he held it unwise to go farther. It would take a long time to work out the solution of the social question, and in the end it would turn out to be as much an affair of Christian education as of Christian economics.⁸

In the same sermon in which he had denounced the excessive number of drinking places, he called the attention of his congregation to the fact that there had been formed in Salford an association of workingmen to work for the improvement of the dwellings of the poor, and he urged the men before him to interest themselves in the same cause. The death rate in that district was much higher than in most parts of England. Better

housing would reduce it, and sanitary precautions would lessen the frequency of such diseases as typhoid and scarlet fever.⁹

The Bishop frequently wandered through the slums of Manchester and, observing the unhealthful dwellings of the poor, became interested in the sanitary condition of the city. Speaking at a public meeting in the Salford Town Hall in the spring of 1890, he declared that the improvement of the housing of the poor would result in the saving of a thousand lives a year. He held up a map of the borough showing the death-rate in different districts. He said that the rotten blotches and patches that covered Salford reminded him of the body of a leper; the wreck of life and morals was completed by the 1,027 drinking houses which covered that small area. He urged the Catholics of the diocese to join associations formed to bring pressure to bear upon the authorities of the borough in the interest of sanitary reform. They should be alert and return to the Town Council only men who would concern themselves with the public health, the happiness and welfare of the people.¹⁰

Replying to the address of welcome addressed to him on his return from Rome on the receipt of the Cardinalate, he referred to the need for rescue work among those of his own religious body. The country, and especially the great towns, he declared, were strewn with the wreckage of Catholic families, wrecked ". . . by ignorance . . . by thriftlessness and neglect, but especially by drink, by grinding poverty, and the detestable laissez-faire system of political economy which triumphed for a century and more over the dictates of Christianity." He feared that he was faced with a gigantic work of human salvage. Catholics should be moved to take up this task by love and conscience, but, if these failed, the public opinion of the country would force them into action, for the English people were beginning to redeem the past. The capitalist, he said, should share with his neighbour not only his goods but his knowledge, his sympathy and his personal care.¹¹

Cardinal Vaughan was the principal speaker at the sixth annual conference of the Catholic Truth Society which was held in Portsmouth in the autumn of 1893. He gave an address on the key to

the social problem, which, he said, meant in the wider sense, how they could best promote the happiness of the various classes of society. In another sense it meant how they could further the happiness, welfare and contentment of the working classes, especially those among them who were badly housed, badly fed and subjected to special trials and privations. He denied that the social problem was primarily a stomach question. The nobility of man, his spiritual nature, must likewise be recognised and satisfied.¹²

In December, 1893, the Cardinal Archbishop inaugurated The Catholic Social Union, the threefold object of which was to bridge over the chasm separating the east from the west, and unite all Catholics on the Christian basis of friendly interests and of mutual good will; to save great numbers of Catholics in danger of being lost to their religion and to Christianity; and to safeguard future society by strengthening the hold of the Church on the rising generation. The Cardinal devoted part of his Lenten Pastoral in the year 1894 to a discussion of the purpose of the Catholic Social Union. He declared that it should especially concentrate its efforts on adolescents, in order to save them from the perils of London life. To this end, he went on to say, recreative clubs and classes of various kinds ought to be established under the guidance of ladies and gentlemen who should act as voluntary "workers" in their behalf.¹³

Austin Oates, in a paper read before the 1894 meeting of the Catholic Truth Society, expatiated on the work of the Union and called upon lay people, in a position to do so, to give themselves to the personal service for which this work urgently called. Dr. Mooney took advantage of the same occasion to deplore the inactivity of educated and prosperous Catholics in the cause of social reform, and to urge them to step into the breach.¹⁴

At a dinner of the Article Club in 1896, Cardinal Vaughan said that he had come not to teach but to learn. It seemed to him as an outsider that the great question of the day and the future was industrial peace which could not be brought about while injustice reigned in any section of the community.

Capital and Labour, he was convinced, should not live in perpetual antagonism. Even boards of conciliation and arbitration, which had done much in the past, should have only a transient existence; for to make them permanent would seem to place Capital and Labour in hostile camps. Dominant selfishness, he said, was the enemy of both Capital and Labour, and religion alone could curb this selfishness. He urged upon the employers their duty to provide for the old age or sickness of their employees.¹⁵

In 1899 the Catholic Truth Society held its annual meeting at Stockport. Among the prominent churchmen who addressed the conference were Dr. Barry, who read a paper on "Laymen in the Church," Dom Aidan Gasquet, who contrasted the work of the laity in the Middle Ages with their position in the Church today, to the disadvantage of the present situation, and Monsignor Ward, who discussed the subject of education. The latter called attention to the recent establishment of houses for the clergy at Oxford and Cambridge, in order that those who intended to teach in Catholic secondary schools might be able to pursue their studies at the universities. The Cardinal, in his address, said that the Catholic Church in England was deeply interested in the social, economic and religious condition of the people. The deplorable condition of the masses of the poor was largely the result of the vices of the upper classes in the past. It was, he thought, a natural consequence of utilitarian philosophy and of the inordinate growth of selfish individualism. Adverting to the lamentable housing conditions, he declared that millions of human creatures were sheltered worse than the cattle and horses of many a lord or squire. Nearly a million of the London poor should be rehoused.¹⁶

On this occasion Vaughan expressed the hope that the old age pension scheme might bring some relief, but the pension must be sufficient to keep its recipient in frugal comfort. The well-to-do should tax themselves or be taxed for their poorer brothers. In October of the same year he received a deputation representing a "national committee of organised labour," being trades unions and friendly societies which had assumed the advocacy of Charles

Booth's pension scheme, namely, that every person of sixty-five or over should have an inalienable right to a pension of five shillings a week. The Cardinal, in expressing the utmost sympathy with the principle of the thing, said that in England, a country which lived by its manufactures, the population was being used up before its time, and men and women thus thrown aside must be saved from destitution. He was not yet convinced, however, that Booth's scheme of old age pensions for *all* people of a given age was workable or just.¹⁷

One of the group that waited on the distinguished ecclesiastic on that occasion summed up the interview in these words: "Gracious, courtly, refined and with something of a regal air, the Cardinal was, nevertheless, out of touch with the world about him. He wanted to be sympathetic, but did not quite know how, and moved uneasily in dealing with our subject, as one who travels on unfamiliar ground. But he gave us his blessing in general terms, and the clergy of his church were never among our opponents. Our deputation to him was worth, in influence, half a score of public meetings."¹⁸

Vaughan was also interested in the welfare of seamen. At the Portsmouth meeting of the Catholic Truth Society, at which Captain Fitzgerald, R. N., one of the harbour masters of London, read a paper on the "Merchant Service," Father Fletcher read one on "Seamen's Clubs," and Father Goldie on the "Society of Saint Vincent de Paul and Its Work among Sailors," Cardinal Vaughan strongly advocated special work for sailors and added a plea for similar activities in behalf of soldiers and agricultural labourers. In the summer of 1897 he opened the new premises of the "Catholic Seamen's Home and Institute" in Wellclose-square, Saint George's. At a meeting in November, 1894, when speaking to the supporters of his plans, he said that seafaring men thoroughly deserved all the kindness that could be bestowed on them. The work prospered; but, like his interest in the Catholic Prisoners' Aid Society, this was only one of his many works of zeal.¹⁹

In the Pastoral which Vaughan issued on the occasion of the

Queen's Diamond Jubilee he expressed thanksgiving for the improvement in the condition of the people. At the same time, however, he reminded his countrymen that the wretched hovels in which human beings were still forced to live, the appalling overcrowding and the cruel cutting down of wages under the sweating system, were among the social wrongs that awaited redress.²⁰

In spite of rapidly failing health, the Cardinal lived long enough to see the Education Act of 1902 placed among the Statutes of the Realm, and to realise the fulfillment of another dream when Westminster Cathedral, with its Byzantine tower commanding a view of a wide area of London, was opened for public worship in 1903. When he died, his catafalque rested before its high altar.²¹

THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD FORESHADOWED

The turn of the century found the Catholics of England following the tradition of Manning and doing excellent work by their attacks on particular evils. They lacked, however, the corporate strength of a widespread social consciousness encompassing the social problem as a whole, and had not yet begun to place that special emphasis on the needs of workmen which was to hallmark Catholic activity before the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, when they expressed their zest for human betterment by founding an organisation for social study. Meanwhile they had employed public conferences and the columns of the Catholic press as the chief channels for the diffusion of their theories. Lack of space forbids quotation in extenso from such addresses and such articles, but sufficient attention will be paid to them to indicate the general trend of Catholic thought on social subjects on the eve of the formation of the Guild.²²

At the 1900 meeting of the Catholic Truth Society, such questions as the guardianship of the poor and follow-up work among young people who had left school were brought up. Mr. J. W. Gilbert and Lady Edmund Talbot, for example, discussed "Rescue Work," and Mr. Chilton Thomas, Manager of the Home for Friendless Youth, Liverpool, also read a paper on that topic.²³

In the same year, the Rev. Richard Richardson considered the menace of drink to workmen in an article which he wrote for the *London Tablet*. He called upon every bishop, priest and layman to enlist in a campaign to fight and eventually rout the enemy. "The 'fons mali,' " he declared, "is the public drinking bar; and so long as millions of our workingmen and our better class young men find these places of real temptation open to them, we may stand at the door and give the pledge to each one as he comes out, and, nevertheless, the battle will still rage on. . . . Only look at the expenditure and care of the Government to prevent the spread of smallpox; look at the millions spent in this African war in subjugating the enemy thousands of miles away, whilst at home we have an enemy ten thousand times more dangerous to England's future greatness, allowed, nay, licensed by the Government, to flourish and to go on destroying the glory and strength of the country, not to mention the awful crimes resulting from it and always going on in our midst. Now, if only half as many millions were spent judiciously in rescuing our people from themselves, they would be thoroughly well spent. . . . Our honest English workman does not wish to throw his wages away every week, but the Government takes care that he shall have no other place of relaxation except the public house or places where drink forms the chief recreation." ²⁴

At the Newcastle meeting of the Catholic Truth Society, Mr. Anstruther likewise considered the temperance aspect of the question of social reform. He believed that the Church should do more along this line, because such efforts as were being made were too infrequent and too spasmodic. He said that workmen should be provided with innocent substitutes for the tavern. At the same meeting, Father Cuthbert declared that the Church could win the allegiance of the mass of the people only by applying religious truth to current social problems. In response to the appeal of the Bishop, societies for saving the weak and the helpless had been formed in most dioceses, but it was doubtful, he thought, if they were receiving as much support as they should from people of means and leisure.²⁵

Father Bernard Vaughan, S. J., addressed a meeting of the English branch of the Girls' Protective Society on the fifth of June, 1902, and praised the work of the organisation. He recommended such a society for centres like London, where girls coming in search of employment were in danger of falling a prey to unscrupulous men and women.²⁶

"Social Work," as people generally understand the term, was receiving increased attention. By 1903, three types of settlement work were in evidence: district visiting and relieving; recreational clubs and classes, and the care and instruction of children. Where relief was necessary, experience had proved that it was better to give it in kind than in money. By such activities, Catholics paved the way for the establishment in 1910 of the most important of their settlement houses, the Catholic Settlement and Centre for Social Workers at Bermondsey, located in one of the worst slums of London. The important task of keeping Catholic working boys from seeking recreation in degrading surroundings had been assumed by the Catholic Boys' Brigade. This organisation which has now almost entirely given place to the Boy Scout movement made use of military drill and physical exercises to discipline the boys and to provide them with wholesome diversion.²⁷

In January, 1904, the Bishop of Salford, in an address before the Manchester and Salford Coöperative Society, spoke in praise of the coöperative movement and of the efforts that were being made to eradicate the evils produced by the growth of industrialism. Later in the year, May Quinlan, whose experiences in the London courts had led her to conclude that mechanism was crushing out individualism, urged that religious influences be brought to bear on what she regarded as the progressive scheme for removing working communities to country districts.²⁸

Whenever two or more Catholics meet together in public, there is danger of their breaking out into mutual congratulations on their worthy accomplishments as Catholics, irrespective of whether or not they can point to a sufficient number of objective achievements to justify their sanguine state of mind. (Inci-

dentally, be it said, they share the weakness with other groups seeking self-expression en masse.) But, as we have seen, healthy discontent and adverse criticism have not been absent from the observations which English Catholics have made on the part which they were playing in the field of social reform.

Of such a nature were some reflections advanced in a paper on "Our Duty as Citizens" which Frances Zanetti, Inspector to the Chorlton Union, Manchester, read at the 1905 meeting of the Catholic Truth Society. "Let us consider, as Catholics, whether we really fulfil to the best of our ability all our duties as citizens, or whether, as sometimes alleged, we restrict our efforts and energies to matters solely affecting our own concerns. . . . We should make up our minds to be citizens, associating ourselves with every movement for the improvement of social conditions, not restricting our attention purely to Catholic affairs. . . . Every day we are confronted with new difficulties, new social problems demanding solution by serious thought and practical effort. Can anyone allege that public morality, emigration, the development of our Colonial Empire, physical deterioration, the housing of the poor, the feeding of children and the ever-growing acuteness of the labour difficulty are subjects of less interest than even the education question to citizen Catholics?"²⁹

Two years later, Mrs. Crawford spoke in a similar vein when, pointing out that there were many things in Socialism which were the inevitable result of progress, and stating that certain features of the education question should not be opposed, she declared that the worst thing was not advanced opinions, but the lethargy of the great mass of those who did nothing.³⁰

At the same time Catholics were receiving criticism, both favourable and adverse, from non-Catholic sources. For example, in the *Heart of The Empire*, published in 1907, we read: "The Roman Catholic Church is doing heroic work amongst the very poorest. Her schools, on which so much effort has been expended, are in many respects models of their kind. They educate the poorest of the poor. . . . They are for the most part carried on in a spirit of devotion beyond all praise. But the Roman Catholic

Church is too hopelessly submerged by the mere weight of numbers to be any effective influence beyond the limits of its own immediate adherents. Its priests are few and hard-driven; its regular Orders show a singular disinclination to throw themselves into work in the congested districts. The lay element is almost completely absent . . . the paucity of numbers, both workers and adherents, leaves the body with but little influence upon the general life of the crowd; at present there appears but scanty possibility of such an increase of either as to materially affect the grave questions of the future of the city race.”³¹

Early in 1908, Father Bernard Vaughan was known to wax indignant at the mere suggestion that he might regard the opposition to the sweating system as exaggerated. “The sweating set,” he exclaimed, “has no conscience to shame it into penitence; its ears are deaf to the cries of its victims; its eyes are blind to the unutterable misery. Truth to tell, when a man puts dividends where he ought to put salvation, nothing will move him but the apparatus of law. . . . Believe me when I tell you that the vast majority of the community has no idea at all of the sweating practices that obtain in our midst. . . . Fancy your asking me if I think the sweating question has been exaggerated. It has not been, because the iniquitous thing cannot be exaggerated.”³²

A year or two before the Catholic Social Guild came into existence, its organisation was prefigured by a rapidly growing belief that Catholics should take a greater interest in the study and solution of social problems, a conviction which received both written and vocal expression. Two contributions more ambitious than the rest may be selected for somewhat detailed treatment, because they show with special clearness the new direction that was being taken by the current of Catholic thought. These were *Some Ways and Means of Social Study* by Leslie A. St. L. Toke and Virginia M. Crawford’s *Ideals of Charity*.

Mr. Toke decried the appalling ignorance of the rich and well-educated with regard to social questions and their fear of anything suggesting Socialism. He cited as an example the failure and dissolution of the Catholic Social Union “because its

name was supposed in some occult manner to connect it with 'that dreadful Socialism.' " He went on to say: "Unfamiliar with Catholic social principles as taught by Popes and saints and theologians, or with the results so far arrived at in social theory and experiment, the wealthier and more advantageously situated Catholics are for the most part complacently assured that there is no need for them to study social questions, or to make any social effort other than the indiscriminate bestowal of alms and patronage. . . ." ³³

The obvious results of such ignorance were brought home to Catholics by the absence of Catholic names from the lists of the councils of various excellent unsectarian reform societies. Mr. Toke pointed out that this apathy toward civic and social questions might be explained by the fact that Catholics, having been cast off for three centuries from active participation in civic life, had lost the habit of citizenship, with the result that they were "as completely unable to realise the fundamental change that has taken place in political, social and economic questions as were the French noblesse on the eve of the Revolution." ³⁴

He rejoiced, however, in certain hopeful signs. Some individual Catholics were awakening to a sense of their social responsibilities, and there resided in the Catholic body a latent power for civic usefulness, a capacity which only needed to be awakened by knowledge of social facts and guided by training in social science. Recognising the need for the study of social problems, he suggested a plan for social study and mentioned oral instruction, books, observation and experiment as the three divisions under which such study might be grouped. ³⁵

Thought-provoking and important reflections are sometimes relegated to notes. It may be recalled that Langlois and Seignobos chose one of these humble spots in their work on historical methodology for their interesting explanation of what constitutes an historical fact. Mr. Toke used a footnote to suggest the desirability for England of a "Catholic Social organisation at once so intelligent and so enthusiastic as that rapidly growing French association called 'Le Sillon.' " ³⁶

Thus did he anticipate the Catholic Social Guild which, being still a going concern after nearly two decades of existence, seems destined to triumph over its destructive critics, a good fortune not vouchsafed the ill-fated French society which had commanded the admiration of Mr. Toke.

Mrs. Crawford struck a like note in a clarion call to Catholics to come out of their isolation and take an active part in the social and political life of England. She believed that the process of their emergence from the catacombs which had lasted from the time of Catholic emancipation almost to the close of the century had been hastened by the great number of converts who, on their entrance into the Church, brought with them no sense of self-effacement, or aloofness from social work. In the first decade of the twentieth century Catholics were at last free to take their place unhampered in the life of the community. Like Mr. Toke, Mrs. Crawford lauded the extensive social activities of French Catholics and deprecated the mistaken notion of some of her English coreligionists who believed that if they subscribed to a number of charities nothing further should be expected of them. She added that she thought a certain class of charity sermon was responsible for that inadequate view. "How often are we told from the pulpit that, if we cannot give personal help, we can always give money, that all we are asked to do is to write a cheque. . . . The idea that we can contract out of our social and human obligations by money payments . . . is at the root not only of much misplaced charity and wasteful expenditure, but of the false relationship between rich and poor that frequently prevails. Individual thought and devotion are needed far more than money." ³⁷

There was need, Mrs. Crawford believed, for cultivation of a broader outlook and the bringing of a wider knowledge to the elucidation of specific problems. Heretofore Catholic efforts had been confined mainly to parochial activities. The narrowness which came from such isolation could be counteracted if the custom prevailing in nearly all the English public schools and in many girls' high schools were adopted and the trouble taken

to bring boys and girls into touch with some definite social work.³⁸

"If some pious people," she wrote, "could only be convinced that organisation and method are neither 'modern' nor 'original' they would be less prejudiced against them. . . ." She cited Saint Vincent de Paul's condemnation of casual methods of relief, and his work for the coördination of philanthropic effort, and she expressed the hope that with this model in mind Catholics would relinquish their belief that indiscriminate alms-giving was somehow a note of true Catholic charity. The association known as The Ladies of Charity, founded by Saint Vincent, admirably illustrated the benefits of charitable organisations. This society, already in existence for eight years in England, had done a great deal to bring Catholic social workers out of their isolation.³⁹ Mrs. Crawford, as we shall see in another connection, deplored the backwardness of Catholic women in organised social endeavour.

In February, 1908, an article signed by the letter "P," but bearing the marks of the authorship of Charles Plater, appeared in the *Month*. It was entitled "A Plea for Catholic Social Action." The writer deplored the apathy of Catholics in the matter of social work and stressed the imperative need for social study on the part of clergy and laity. Experts, he said, should be engaged to create a sound social literature. A second need was for the more or less organised study of social questions in Catholic educational institutions. In the third place, workmen's clubs should be organised or reorganised, to make of them the training ground of Catholic labour leaders and speakers.⁴⁰

Educated Catholic laymen, he thought, could help in this work: "A busy professional man may not see his way to 'entertaining' the members of a club where nothing is done except card playing and beer-drinking, but he will be more ready to help if he knows that a body of intelligent workmen are keen to learn from him something that may help them to be more useful members of society."⁴¹

The Church, the author emphasised, had an important work to

do, for, with the disappearance of the old social and political landmarks, many were looking to it to give the country her bearings. It was clear that, while members of the working class were in the main distrustful of the churches which they looked upon as the elaborate proofs of a class interest, they were responsive to the message of the Gospels and had as yet by no means assumed a deliberate theory of materialism. Catholics, he said, should help them, but to do so they must become more Catholic and less parochial.⁴²

Early in 1909 another writer in the *Month* warned of a certain danger now that the Catholics were shaking off their lethargy and beginning to participate in the movement for social reform. The importance of the soul must not be lost sight of, for, if advance in material well-being were necessarily accompanied by higher spiritual development, the leisured and refined classes would be uniformly the more holy. However, the Church did not lose sight of the great dependence of the soul upon the body.⁴³

The Archbishop of Westminster addressed the members of the Society of Saint Vincent de Paul at their meeting at Manchester in the autumn of 1909. He urged upon them the duty of doing their best to minimise the terrible social difficulties that they saw round about them. He thought that some members of the society ought to familiarise themselves with the report of the Poor Law Commission, so that they might be in a position to give Catholics a reasoned opinion as to the various remedies which were being proposed by the Commissioners.⁴⁴

Meanwhile, the Catholic Truth Society had presented in two volumes entitled respectively *The Catholic Church and Labour* and *Social Work for Layfolk*, a miscellany of contributions that had been made to the development of Catholic Social Thought at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. In the first of these volumes a number of articles were contributed by Abbot Snow, O.S.B. He approached his subject historically and considered successively the relations between the Church and the Slave, the Church and the Serf, the Church and the Crafts, and the Church and the Workman. The latter was a

discussion of present conditions, when "the personal dominion of the master, the personal service of the serf, the personal relations in crafts, have yielded to the impersonal dominion of invisible capital." ⁴⁵

The second of these two volumes published by the Catholic Truth Society was less reminiscent in tone. It sounded, indeed, something of a prophetic note, its very title, *Social Work for Catholic Layfolk*, giving a hint of the challenge that it contained. For example, Father John Norris made an appeal for the help of the laity. Above all, he believed, personal service was needed. Bertrand Devas gave a fascinating account of work among the hop-pickers, which was calculated to inspire the reader with a zeal for share in such a labour. Catholic work in that field had begun in 1905, when Franciscan Friars undertook to bring much needed religious succour to the great number of Catholic pickers in the hop-fields. There was a crying need for lay help if this work were to succeed. Although the spiritual interests of the people during the brief hop-picking season were paramount, material assistance was also rendered when necessary. Mr. Devas cited as an instance in point, the encouragement which was given to boys to learn trades and not drift into the ranks of casual labour. The writer denounced the custom of keeping the departing pickers for hours at the station, for the interval between the hour set for assembling and the time when the train was to leave was usually given over to the exuberant patronage of the local public-houses. ⁴⁶

Papers on "Retreats for Workers" and "Study Clubs for Working Men" even more directly prepared the way for the Guild. The first of these, by Charles Plater, was the reprint of a paper which he had read at the Catholic Conference at Brighton in 1906, wherein he had pleaded the cause of what became one of the most lively interests of his astoundingly active life. The political, social and economic revolution brought about by the development of industry had tended to make workmen inaccessible to Christian influences. Forming a class apart, they found no religious atmosphere created for them as their working

forebears had found in the mediæval parish. Plater reminded the clergy and the educated laity that they had been called upon by the late Pontiff to "go to the people." The workingman, moreover, did not feel that the adherents of organised forms of religion were interested in his welfare; like members of other classes of society, he was allured by the growing passion for pleasure, and was being immersed in a flood of literature and lectures, materialistic and secularist in tone.⁴⁷

Clergy and laity, declared the writer, must draw together the severed parts of society in accordance with the principles of the Gospel and provide not only charity, but social justice as well. They must evince an interest in the temporal miseries of the workers, and not merely exhort them to acquiesce in present injustice in the hope of meriting an eternal recompense. He quoted Dr. Barry, who had said "If I am asked how it [Christianity] is to be brought to the masses, I reply, 'show them how they can be saved by it and enabled to live a pure and human life in this world; then perhaps they will believe.'"⁴⁸

The workman, he was certain, would be reached through the workman. An élite must be raised up from the ranks of labour to impress upon their fellows the principles of the Gospel, and work for social amelioration along the lines laid down in Leo's Encyclicals. Above all, was it necessary to relieve the great spiritual poverty of the working class. The social work—that of retreats for workers—which the writer set about to describe, seemed at first sight scarcely to merit its name. Yet, many social workers who had little sympathy with revealed religion had borne witness to the marked and far-reaching social effects of spiritual retreats. Plater pointed out that these retreats were no innovation in the Church; the idea had been worked out with remarkable success on the continent of Europe. Drawing his illustrations from Belgium, he indicated the advantages to the individual workman and his family of the few days withdrawal from the hurly-burly of life—a period of respite from its grinding exactions spent in listening to and reflecting on spiritual discourses. Retreats began by giving that supernatural background to life

for which the workers were groping, and ended by producing a widespread endeavour to improve the material conditions of the poor and distressed.⁴⁹

The other significant contribution was made by Father Cyril C. Martindale, S.J., a convert to Catholicism and a prolific writer on a variety of themes. His paper dealt at length with what was to be another permanent feature of the rapidly expanding social activities of English Catholics—namely, study clubs for workingmen. He gave a clear account of the Cercles d'Etudes, French study clubs which, he thought, were susceptible of adaptation to English conditions. He believed that in addition to the purely literary work of such circles was the added advantage which accrued to the directors by association with men of other classes than their own.⁵⁰

When considering objections which had been made to the scheme for organising such a system of study clubs, Father Martindale made a few excellent points. It had been said, for instance, that there was a primary duty to protect the young, to keep their faith undimmed and their innocence unsullied, by refraining from "putting thoughts into their heads." It was really too naïve to assume that silence on the part of their religious guides concerning the great religious and social problems would prevent young people from hearing about them. Then there was the objection of another sort: why not depend on the efficacy of the pure Gospel and not introduce political and economic theories? The Encyclical of Leo bore witness to the connection between social study and the living of a Christian life which demanded for its exercise a certain minimum of material well-being. Moreover, he pointed out, the preliminary of salutary material "works" was frequently intellectual activity. Great movements followed ideas, and the working classes shared the new alertness which was developing in the matter of *ideas*. The objections they could and did put, at the close of lectures, proved it as also did their newspapers and the great demand for popularised science. The writer believed that the kind of school "in which not soon enough is acknowledged the intellectual trans-

formation of the growing creature's soul; the needful abandonment of memory for reflection work; the duty of supplying *ideas* and forcing the mind to work with these . . . will go by the wall; and with it, we cannot but think, those very excellent clubs where the manhood part of growing men is not catered for."⁵¹

That these aspirations for workers' retreats and study clubs were realised so early by the Catholic Social Guild was probably due to the fact that those who expressed them were not so many voices crying in the wilderness, but rather the mouthpieces of a quickening social interest on the part of a considerable number of thoughtful English Catholics. Other names suggest themselves in this connection, that of Monsignor Parkinson, for example. With the exception of Father Plater, probably no person stands out so clearly in the early history of the Social Guild as Monsignor Henry Parkinson. At the Conference of the Catholic Truth Society he read a paper on "Catholics and the Social Movement." He spoke first of all of the social unrest resulting from such evils as the great number of people existing below the poverty line, the extent of chronic unemployment, the existence of sweated labour, the increasing abandonment of agriculture for industrial pursuits and the physical deterioration of the young.⁵²

He mentioned certain unalterable principles held by the Church. Among them he cited the inviolable right of each individual to the use and disposal of his properties, subject only to the extreme necessity of others, the free choice of labour, and the privilege of fair competition. People were entitled, moreover, to such leisure as would permit them to practice their religion, to improve their minds, and to live virtuous individual and domestic lives. From this principle arose the claim for moderate hours of labour.⁵³

In pointing out to Catholics their duty to perform social work, Monsignor Parkinson admitted that an English Catholic library of social manuals had yet to be written. There had been some good work done along this line, but it was not highly specialised and too limited in quantity. In the words, "What we want is a series of cheap, popular manuals on the whole range of social

questions," we find the expression of another need which the Catholic Social Guild was destined to fill.⁵⁴

THE ORIGIN OF THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD

The English Catholic revival which had begun in the nineteenth century, resulted in certain remarkable developments in the twentieth, probably the most important of which was the Catholic Social Guild. The Eucharistic Congress of 1908 was held in London, and it was believed that it was this event more than any other which gave to English Catholics a conclusive proof of their growing strength. We have on record numerous proofs of the clarity of individual social vision and the effectiveness of individual social action. Works of charity abounded—the fruitful half century of existence through which the English branch of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society had passed bore witness to this fact, as did the self-sacrificing services of religious orders and the numerous associations and rescue agencies which flourished throughout the country. But such efforts as these were isolated or spasmodic. Two important elements were absent: the coördination of social activities and the existence of a systematic effort on a large scale to study and diffuse Catholic social principles and apply them to prevailing conditions. The institution of National Catholic Congresses, and, above all, the formation of the Guild, did away with these deficiencies.⁵⁵

Specifically, there were strong reasons to favour the creation of such a society as the Guild. Catholic specialists, clerical and lay, were isolated one from the other, and consequently, less useful than they might have been to their socially-minded co-religionists. Men and women already engaged in social study complained of a lack of both literature and guidance. Many Catholics thought that the growing number of un-Christian social theories had to be combated. There was a feeling, too, that Catholic efforts must be devoted to the accomplishment of social works more comprehensive in scope than those included in the word "charities." The Catholic population gave a large quota

to the destitute class of the country, and these unfortunates had specific claims on the good will of their more fortunate brothers. What was more, Catholics entering public life in greater numbers than ever before needed just such training for their new responsibilities as the Guild could give them.⁵⁶

The first steps in the formation of the Guild were taken at the annual Conference of the Catholic Truth Society, which was held in Manchester in 1909. There Father Plater came in contact with those kindred spirits whose collaboration not only gave the Guild its initial momentum, but assured its continued success.

On September 21, 1909, at Ingham's Hotel in Manchester, the pioneers of the Guild met at a very informal luncheon at which Monsignor Parkinson maintained a semblance of order and Mr. Toke outlined the nature of the new society. Before mentioning the latter's plan, however, it might be well to pause to introduce some of the distinguished company assembled there. Most of them are already known by name because of references that have been made to their activities on behalf of social reform, for the Guild was to them not a beginning, but the climax, of their social ideals.

Foremost among them was Father Charles Dominic Plater. Born in 1875, of Polish and English ancestry, he entered the Jesuit order at an early age. Before many years had passed he gave evidence of the lively interest in his fellow-men and the brilliancy of mind and genius for organisation which resulted in that absolute subordination of self to social service that brought about his death at the age of forty-five. His super-sensitiveness, his capacity for keen comment and criticism (which at times bordered on smartness), his impatience of apathy, his tendency towards spasmodic action and his too great eagerness for applause and immediate results bore the germs of personal weaknesses, which, if they had been allowed to grow unchecked, might in time have appreciably lessened or even destroyed his ability to bring to a successful issue the numerous social works which he undertook. But these imperfections dwindled until they practically disappeared under the influence of his religious ideals and

the rigour of his wisely imposed self-discipline. Whilst warping nothing of the essential loveableness which endeared him to every one with whom he came in contact, and leaving full play for his throbbing human sympathy, this discipline gradually whittled away the vices of these virtues, leaving the character of the man strong and detached, filled with a great pity and a boundless capacity for service.⁵⁷

While still a very young man, Plater became interested in social work, though his concept of the direction it should take was of the vaguest. His horror of sweated labour was great, but beyond that there was little intelligent basis for his first efforts, and his somewhat tactless methods of procedure alienated the sympathy of others. As a preliminary step to remedy these defects, he decided to make a thorough study of what had already been accomplished in the social field in England and abroad, so that he might have a basis for scientific conclusions as to the possibility for future developments. He was quick to grasp the rôle which laymen were to play in social work of the near future; but he realised that his ideas were so unfamiliar to the English people that they had to be educated up to them. For this reason, he poured article after article into the Catholic press, describing what was being done abroad and impressing upon his readers the need of such work in their own country. Convinced that, unless God built the house, they laboured in vain that built it, he laid emphasis on the value of religious retreats for the working class, an idea which, though not, strictly speaking, original with him—a London priest had for years been giving bank-holiday retreats for workers—ultimately came to be associated with his name.⁵⁸

One of Plater's articles on retreats for workers, entitled "The Great Social Experiment," published in the *Hibbert Journal*, contained strictures on the tendency to restrict social work to efforts to improve material well-being to the neglect of character building. He offered this phase of the retreat movement as a remedy for the defect, and incidentally as a means for improving the economic condition of the working class.⁵⁹

Plater's biographer, Father Martindale, calls the results of this

article "sensational." It bore fruit even in non-Catholic circles. The Secretary of the Edinburgh Free Church Theological College, for example, was so interested that he immediately made inquiries about retreats. The warden of Liddon House asked leave to reprint the article for private circulation. An Australian correspondent sent word that he would reprint one thousand copies for distribution amongst the clergy of all faiths in that far-off continent.⁶⁰

Although he was only one of the many founders of the Guild, Plater merited the lasting gratitude of the organisation, not alone by virtue of the inspiration which he gave it at its inception, but also because of his untiring efforts to make it a successful venture during the first critical years of its existence. He seems never to have lost an opportunity to address the meetings of the numerous branches, and unceasingly encouraged the formation of study clubs.⁶¹

With the common aim of social welfare as a basis, he entered heartily into interdenominational work. He played a prominent part at more than one of the Summer Schools of the Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions. He was also connected with the Oxford Interdenominational Council for Social Reform, an association formed for the purpose of improving social conditions in Oxford. And he was intensely interested in the arrangements that were being made for the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship planned for 1923. He was dead before that year dawned, but the custom which he inaugurated of coöperation in good works with members of other faiths became a tradition with the Guild.⁶²

In 1914 Father Plater threw himself into constructive effort to soften the hardship of the War and repair its ravages, especially among the soldiers to whom he brought good cheer and in whose moral welfare he expressed untiring interest. He wrote and answered innumerable letters to soldiers at the front; back in England he gave retreats to those preparing for the conflict and brought comfort to their dependents, as well as to the Belgian refugees; he assisted in providing recreational facilities for fighting

men, and urged that their interests be not disregarded after the War. He plunged into all these activities with such devotion, and drew so unstintingly on his spiritual and physical resources, that he never recovered from the effects of the strain. He did not live long after the war, and was as much its victim as if he had fallen at the front. The end came in Malta, whither he had gone ostensibly to restore his shattered health, but really to expand his social work. He died suddenly, of a stroke ". . . when he threw up his hands in the corridor at Valetta, never more to speak or stir. A splendid victory and a most significant gesture of resignation to God's will! Malta gave him something like a soldier's funeral, which he had earned in the spiritual combat of years against darkness and all its battalions."⁶³

Monsignor Henry Parkinson, who became the first President of the Catholic Social Guild, was born in 1852. He held the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the Gregorian University in Rome, and played a prominent part in the training of the clergy, first as Professor of Philosophy at Oscott College, and later as its first Rector, when it became the Central Seminary. He possessed an extensive knowledge of social questions, and was credited with having introduced social study into Catholic secondary schools. He edited and prefaced for the Catholic Truth Society a volume of Encyclicals on social subjects entitled *The Pope and the People*; and the *Primer of Social Science*, which he wrote for the Catholic Social Guild, won an unusual degree of praise from both Catholic and non-Catholic critics. Monsignor Parkinson did not restrict his efforts in the social field to Catholics, but coöperated with non-Catholics, and appeared with people of different religious beliefs at gatherings such as the social conferences at Swanwick. He died in 1924, three years after Father Plater, and by his death the Guild suffered its second great loss.⁶⁴

Most prominent among the women who attended that now famous luncheon at Ingham's were Miss Margaret Fletcher, Mrs. Virginia Crawford and Mrs. (now Lady) Gibbs. Margaret Fletcher, writer, portrait painter and profound student of social questions, is the daughter of an Oxford clergyman, and was re-

ceived into the Catholic Church in 1897. She was editor for a time of *The Crucible*, a journal which she had founded to promote the interest of the higher education of Catholic women, and was the founder and first President of the Catholic Women's League. Miss Fletcher is the author of several books written with striking clarity and logic, and has contributed to numerous periodicals. Mrs. Crawford, who is a journalist, social reformer and staunch advocate of women's rights, has worked zealously for Poor Law reform, and, in the interest of the Catholic Emigration Society, has visited the Canadian settlements of English and Irish children. She has written many articles on literary, social and economic subjects, and she, like Miss Fletcher, was the author of some of the most valuable literature published by the Catholic Social Guild. For seven years she was Honorary Secretary of the Guild, and since 1919 has been Borough Councillor of St. Marylebone. Lady Agnes Gibbs, the brilliant wife of the brilliant newspaperman, essayist and novelist, Sir Philip Gibbs, also early in life became a convert to Catholicism. She has made numerous translations from the French, German and Italian, including Laproni's *Hypnotism and Spiritism*, Baudrillart's challenging work on *Catholicism and the Renaissance*, Bertrin's *Lourdes*, and Gabriel d'Azambuja's *What Christianity Has Done for Women*. She, too, has written for the Catholic Social Guild, and established the "Maryfield" Retreats for Working Boys.⁶⁵

At this meeting the outlines of the new society were sketched. A central committee was formed, composed of Monsignor Parkinson, Dom Lambert Nolle and Mr. Toke, to which was assigned the task of drawing up definite statutes and conducting other business of the projected organisation. Following this gathering of leaders, the devotees of Catholic social study next met at a public meeting of the Conference where they heard Charles Plater talk on the duty of Catholics to make a study of social problems. The Bishops who were present at the conference approved the movement thus launched for the inter-communication of socially-minded Catholics, and the concerted study and widespread diffusion of Catholic social principles. The infant organisation had

not yet received its name. For the time being Plater's designation of it as "A Catholic Society for Social Study" was generally accepted.⁶⁶

The new society developed rapidly. The Provisional Executive met at Oscott College, Birmingham, a little later that same autumn, and Mr. G. C. King was appointed the first Honorary General Secretary. A tentative constitution was drawn up, and plans for the publication of literature were considered. By the first of the new year lists of books were being prepared by the executive committee, and new literature issued. The Guild had already begun to function as a bureau for providing expert opinion on matters connected with social questions. Reporting on a list of seventy-five books to be found at the Public Library at Hull—all dealing with Socialism—that had been submitted to its judgment, it gave as its verdict that not one of them represented the Christian viewpoint on social questions. Guild members mounted the lecture platform, the President, Monsignor Parkinson, becoming one of the main speakers. The first study circles to be formed under the auspices of the Guild were organised by workmen in Liverpool and Birmingham.⁶⁷

Catholic Book Notes, a publication of the Catholic Truth Society, in which the Social Guild received constant and favourable notice before it could boast an organ of its own, in the issue of January 15, 1910, summed up its comments on the history of the first few months of the Guild in these words: "If the great social changes, which are coming in this country, are to be made in harmony with Catholic principles, Catholics must make these principles known. The object of the Guild is to stimulate in Catholics a greater sense of the urgency of the situation, to induce them to learn what is the Catholic standpoint in these matters, and to impart their knowledge to others."⁶⁸

The membership of the Catholic Social Guild steadily increased as the knowledge of its aims and objects became more widely known. While its Executive was completing twenty-two bibliographies, Monsignor Parkinson was giving it wide publicity by his speeches in different localities. Early in 1910 appeared the first

of that series of Year Books which has become a permanent and valuable feature of the literary output of the Guild. Although two thousand copies were issued, it was out of print long before the end of the year. Edited by the Central Committee of the Catholic Social Guild and published by the Catholic Truth Society, the book was conceived for the express purpose of interesting and inspiring the average man rather than of presenting statistical dry-as-dust data for the special student. The editors emphasised the fact that, Gambetta to the contrary notwithstanding, there *is* a social question. In Great Britain it took the form of appalling housing conditions, widespread destitution accentuated by unemployment, a high infant mortality rate, intemperance and sweating. Not only the behests of the Popes and the needs of the Church, but the charity of God impelled Catholics to participate in its solution.⁶⁹

Lack of space forbids an attempt to summarise the contents of this first Year Book. In addition to its inspirational matter, it contained suggestions for the future activities of the Guild and described existing Catholic organisations. A useful feature was the brief survey that was made of social progress during the year 1909.⁷⁰

Leaders in this new trend of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain spent the first few years of the Guild's history urging upon Catholics, by pen and spoken word, the duty of social study and of social work. As was to be expected, Father Plater and Monsignor Parkinson were most active in blazing the trail; although others, like Archbishop Whiteside of Liverpool, who lent the weight of his position to the support of the Guild, and Mr. Henry Somerville, who early began to use his talents in its service, were far from idle as convincing propagandists.⁷¹

When the Guild was eight months old, Father Plater, in an article published in an American periodical, described it as "a centre of reference and a fountain head of social information . . . a body of representative Catholics, clergy and laity, which aims not at control, but at enlightening. . . . Catholic social study in England," he rejoiced, "is in a fair way to securing that definite-

ness and coördination which are so indispensable in the present situation.”⁷²

In another article, entitled “Social Research and Propaganda,” Father Plater emphasised the significance of the Guild as an instrument for Catholic social education. He drew special attention to the scarcity of trained teachers, because it had proved to be even more difficult to secure a competent lecturer on social questions than an audience to listen to him. In this article he declared that the poor, to a Catholic, “are not merely a possible asset to the Empire, or a national menace, or a disgrace to civilisation, or an object of ethical pity. They are, above all, brothers and sisters, members of Christ’s Mystical Body, temples of the Holy Spirit.”⁷³

Although Plater was convinced that the bulk of social work would inevitably fall to the lot of the laity, he looked to the clergy to take the lead in promoting social activity. The influence exerted by a priest, which, as Mr. Charles Booth observed, was much greater than that possessed by a clergyman of any other creed, would be of incalculable value if extended to the field of social action, and such action, he declared, was required of a priest, not as a diversion, but as an inseparable part of his calling.⁷⁴

He devoted, in fact, an entire volume to *The Priest and Social Action*, to which the Bishop of Northampton wrote an introduction expressing the hope that Father Plater’s enthusiasm might prove infectious. The author himself made a strong plea for social study in seminaries, and urged that the men after ordination continue to participate in and guide such work. He gave considerable attention to the social activity of the clergy on the Continent, with the hope of stimulating English priests to emulation.⁷⁵

One of the most inspiring lectures which Father Plater ever delivered on the social question was that which he gave in Ireland in May, 1912, before the University College Conference of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society. He began by rejoicing in the opportunity to address young men who had not yet reached the

age at which a man "accepts things as inevitable, accepts the world's evils as incurable, and just settles down in his groove trying to save his own soul, or feather his nest, as the case may be, and perhaps pick up a few pieces out of the social wreckage." In this discourse he recounted the achievements of social Catholics on the Continent, and called the attention of his hearers to the acuteness of the social problem in Great Britain. He revealed the true purpose of his speech, when, after describing the origin and accomplishments of the Catholic Social Guild, the most suitable weapon yet forged by English Catholics for grappling intelligently with this problem, he exhorted the Irish to follow this example, and found a similar organisation in their country. As will be seen in another connection, his words did not fall on un-receptive minds.⁷⁶

Other voices were raised in behalf of the Guild. Archbishop Whiteside, for example, when discussing the need for a living wage at a meeting held at Liverpool, at which Monsignor Parkinson made one of his speeches on the work of the Guild, stressed the need for a branch of the Guild in the industrial city of Liverpool. George Milligan, a convert and friend of Archbishop Whiteside, was another staunch advocate for the Guild. His relations with it were the more significant because he was a humble worker who had to his credit the by no means simple accomplishment of having brought about the complete organisation of the dock labourers of the North-end of Liverpool during the great strike of 1911. Leslie Toke, in his preface to a book entitled *Life Through Labour's Eyes*, of which Milligan was the author, called the latter the spokesman of the inarticulate masses of England. The book itself was largely a plea for the Christianisation of the labour movement. In 1913, Milligan, speaking as one who had lived his life amongst the poor, deplored the delay in the founding of the Guild. Had it come into existence twenty-five years before, it would, in his opinion, have averted an immense amount of harm.⁷⁷

In January, 1913, Henry Somerville wrote a thoughtful article for the *Month* on "The Work Before the Catholic Social Guild."

He mentioned the three conditions which had brought the Catholic social movement into existence: the lack of harmony existing between some important features of the existing social system and the principles of Christian morality, the fact that large sections of the population found it difficult or impossible to live proper human or Christian lives, and the danger that morally wrong and, consequently, socially disastrous, remedies might be applied to the present ills. He declared that the ultimate aim and end of the Social Catholic movement was to rebaptise and Christianise the commonwealth. After discussing at some length the various concerns of the Catholic Social Guild, he concluded by recalling Bishop von Ketteler's statement that the fight between the Church and her enemies would eventually quit the domain of dogma and rage afresh in the domain of social problems. They were, he said, already witnessing the fulfillment of that prophecy.⁷⁸

THE PRODUCTION AND CIRCULATION OF SOCIAL LITERATURE

No attempt will be made in this section to give an exhaustive account, or even a cursory survey, of *all* the Catholic social literature which the Catholic Social Guild, in accordance with one of its avowed aims, has supplied from the first days of its existence to the time of writing. Some of this literature has received, or will receive, considerable notice in other connections. In this section the purpose will be simply to give an idea of the character of the main types of books and pamphlets produced by the Guild, with occasional references to their contents by way of illustration. The Catholic social literature, which was produced prior to the time of the Catholic Social Guild, was published by the Catholic Truth Society, which had added that type of publication to its more characteristic output of apologetic books and pamphlets. This organisation continued to publish the social literature edited by the Guild until such time as the latter took over the publication of its own works.

The Year Book, which has steadily appeared at the beginning of each year was, and still is, the most distinctive feature of the

Guild's literary output. The first, that of 1910, has been noted. Those for the succeeding five years followed the same general plan of pointing out the progress and activities of the Guild at home and giving sympathetic attention to what was being done along similar lines by Catholic social agencies abroad. For instance, in the Year Book for 1911, there was an account of the importance which the social question assumed in the deliberations of the first Annual Catholic Congress which was held at Leeds in 1910. The second part of this Year Book was devoted to a consideration of "Some Catholic Social Forces"—Catholic charitable and social works which do not fall within the scope of this work, on account of their strictly conventual or parochial nature, or by reason of their limited aim.⁷⁹

By 1912 it was felt that less emphasis need be placed on the enunciation of principles and the exhortation to action, and more space given to specific achievements. For instance, the Year Book for 1913 contained a diary of events bearing on the social and industrial life of the people during the year 1912. Scotland began to receive consideration, accounts being given of such institutions as the Catholic Social Reform Association which organised lectures for the purpose of stimulating interest in social questions, and The Catholic Institute which Archbishop Mackintosh opened in Glasgow. This was designed as a central meeting place for clergy and laity, and a convenient headquarters for all kinds of Catholic social organisations and activities. Attention continued to be given to existing Catholic societies and institutions like the Catholic Young Men's Society and the Catholic Settlement Association. Bibliographies on social subjects gleaned from Catholic and non-Catholic sources were another valuable feature of the pre-war Year Books.⁸⁰

The first Year Book to be issued after the outbreak of the war,—that for 1916,—was entitled *National Reconstruction*. This set the style for subsequent years. Henceforth each Year Book was to be devoted to some special topic. For instance, that for 1917 dealt with *Catholics in England, Their Needs and Opportunities*, and that for 1918 was entitled *A Christian Social Cru-*

sade and was given over to the scheme for social reconstruction which had been advanced by the Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions. In 1919 the Guild celebrated its tenth birthday by reviewing the field which had been covered in the decade of its existence, and staking out claims for future advance.

The method of stressing some special topic in each issue of the Year Book has continued to the present day. A practical *Guide to Social Students* appeared in 1920, and *The National Catholic Forces*, which focused attention at the Liverpool Congress in 1920, was the subject matter for the Year Book for 1921. The volume for 1924 was rendered unique by a series of historical sketches called *Letters on Social History* dealing with the relation of the Church to the masses throughout the ages. An interesting episode occurred in connection with the Year Book for 1926, which was called *The Community and the Criminal*, and was written by the Catholic chaplain to Brixton Prison. One reader was so impressed by this volume on the welfare of prisoners as to send an anonymous contribution of one hundred pounds to the Catholic Social Guild.⁸¹

Beginning with 1911 and continuing through 1920, the Guild issued a *Quarterly Bulletin*. Though a slender little paper, it was invaluable for its notes on Catholic social progress at home and abroad, its reviews of contemporary social literature, and its news of projected social legislation, and other topics of current interest. From time to time it contained thought-provoking articles from such trenchant pens as that of Vincent McNabb.

At the request of workingmen, the *Bulletin* was superseded by the *Christian Democrat*, a monthly magazine first issued in January, 1921. Like its predecessor, this paper keeps the members of the Catholic Social Guild in touch with the current activities of its numerous branches, and gives news of recent events in the economic and industrial world. It has between five and six thousand readers and counts among its contributors leading Catholic social thinkers.⁸²

One of the first acts of the Guild was to issue, in conjunction with the Catholic Truth Society, a great number of penny pam-

phlets dealing with social principles. It was also through this channel that Catholic social students were provided for the first time with helpful lists of books. Perhaps the most important pamphlet of the first series was a translation of Leo XIII's Encyclical "On the Condition of the Working Class," with an introduction and synopsis by Monsignor Parkinson. In this way the social teaching of the great Pontiff was brought to the attention of the humblest English workman.⁸³

Many of these pamphlets, timely though they were, proved to have only ephemeral value. Of more permanent utility was the series of *Catholic Studies in Social Reform* published by P. S. King and Son, the purpose of which was to show how Catholic principles might be applied to proposed or existing social legislation. The first of the volumes was entitled *Destitution and Suggested Remedies* and presented to its readers the different schemes which were being proposed for the reform of the Poor Law. This was followed by *Sweated Labour and the Trade Boards Act*, in which was explained the principle of justice behind the agitation for a living wage. The third volume of the series dealt with the ever-present *Housing* problem, and the fourth, *The Church and Eugenics*, written by Rev. Thomas J. Gerrard, aimed to bring the best features of eugenics into harmony with Catholic teachings. Shortly after the appearance of the first four books of this series, the *Athenaeum* paid them the following tribute: "Each page contains some expression of opinion pulsating with concern for the uplifting of our common humanity; and nothing that might shock a too complacent public is whittled of its meaning by ambiguous phrasing."⁸⁴

The War led to the issuing of books and pamphlets designed to rouse the Catholic population of England to work for the general good during those soul-trying times. After the Armistice the Catholic social literature was written for the purpose of urging the people to participate intelligently and unselfishly in the heavy task of reconstruction. These types of publication will be considered in the section given over to Catholic social action in Great Britain during those important years.

With the growth of study clubs—an important feature of Guild activity—there arose an urgent need for textbooks. The Guild was quick to supply this demand. The first texts appeared in the form of a series of four modest but exceedingly useful volumes prepared respectively by Mrs. Crawford, Father Martindale, Father Joseph Keating and Dom Anselm Parker, and Father Watt. Mrs. Crawford's booklet, called *The Church and the Worker*, provided the necessary background for students of economic history by its sketch of the Factory System, the Manchester School of Political Economy, Factory Legislation and Trade Unionism, and the sections which followed, on Catholic principles of social reform and their application to the conditions which had arisen out of those historical developments.⁸⁵

Father Martindale, in his *Gospel and the Citizen*, drew general lessons for social reformers from the life and teachings of Christ. In conclusion he wrote: "As the Christian grows more perfect, more complete will be his renunciation of all individualism and self-seeking; there need be no limit to his rejection of personal ambition and profit. Still, his general work for others (which should rise from the level of justice to that of love) may necessitate a resistance and even aggression which may become a supreme form of self-sacrifice."⁸⁶

The other two volumes on *Questions of The Day* and *Elements of Economics* challenged social students, who had been inspired by the exhortations of Mrs. Crawford and Father Martindale, to meet practical problems with the technical equipment of trained social thinkers. Keating and Parker included in their survey such problems as the poverty which results from inadequate wages, the existence of disgraceful housing conditions and the prevalence of intemperance. Father Watt, in his turn, furnished the social student with clear definitions of economic terms and a brief exposition of economic principles.⁸⁷

One of the most scholarly textbooks published by the Guild was Monsignor Parkinson's *Primer of Social Science*, a book which elicited generous encomiums from the non-Catholic press. Two of these comments from non-Catholic sources may be taken

as representative. The *Hibbert Journal* judged it to be "by far the most compendious manual on the subject that has yet appeared in English," and declared that "it contains authoritative statements of Catholic teaching on social questions which ought to be of great interest to thoughtful people who are outside the Roman community. It is also thoroughly abreast of the recent literature on the subject, and intimately conversant with what social workers are attempting in the British Islands and on the Continent."⁸⁸

The *New Statesman* was even more enthusiastic in its words of appreciation. "Taken all in all," the reviewer wrote, "this is perhaps the best small, cheap introductory primer for economic and political science that is now on the market—in accord, for the most part, with what seem to us the best economic and political writers, democratic in sympathy, and impregnated with a warm sympathy for the disinherited. Its criticisms and proposals are, of course, not exactly our own. It is, however, interesting to see how frequently the authoritative teaching of the English Catholics today approximates in detail to that of the English Socialists, whom (perhaps by Roman misunderstanding of differences) they are officially required to denounce. . . . Its Catholic phraseology will prevent its circulating in the 'Ulsters' of Ireland, Great Britain and the Labour and Socialist world, though a study of it would do them all no end of good, especially when it made them realise what there was to be said against their idols. But to anyone who has ceased to sniff the fires of Smithfield, the book may be confidently recommended as critical, informing and often thought-provoking. In fairness to the large Catholic population, it ought to find a place in every public library."⁸⁹

It was soon apparent that English Catholics were not likely to suffer from a dearth of literature on social questions. The problem arose as to how all this literature was to be circulated, especially among those whose economic status did not warrant their making extensive purchases of books and pamphlets. A supply of "Book-Boxes" was devised to meet this need.

A word of explanation will make clear this method of distributing social literature. On the payment of a small fee, the Catholic Truth Society sends out, on loan, to Guild branches and affiliated societies, a box of books for the use of groups of social students. One type of box will contain an assortment of standard general works, a collection of specialised volumes on various social problems,—Trade Unionism, or Woman's Work and Wages, for example; and to these books, usually the work of non-Catholics, are added a few written from a distinctly Catholic standpoint. Sometimes the whole set of over twenty books deals with a particular subject which some study club may be considering, such as Socialism or International Relations. An effort is made to furnish whatever books are desired, but works of a purely political nature and those representing extreme viewpoints on the social question are generally avoided. The delicate task of selection falls to the lot of the librarian of the Bexhill Library. In addition to lending out Book-Boxes, the Guild makes use of the customary channels for the dissemination of literature, such as libraries and reading rooms.⁹⁰

STUDY CIRCLES AND STUDY SCHEMES

The groups to which these first Book-Boxes were sent were already taking the form of study clubs. The founders of the Guild, in accordance with their aim to develop a social sense among Catholics, held that the concerted study of social questions was absolutely necessary for a thorough understanding of social principles and social conditions, and as an incentive to social work. Quite logically, then, numerous study groups sprang up in England and Scotland, similar to those which were to be found among Catholics on the Continent. The English hierarchy gave them a warm welcome and persistent encouragement. The Bishop of Northampton urged the spread of the study club movement, and the Archbishop of Liverpool went so far as to say that the chief hope for the solution of the social question in England lay in the multiplication of study circles.⁹¹

There are certain characteristic features of such groups. As to membership, all sorts and conditions of people are invited to join with those of similar interests and like degree of intelligence for the pursuit of social study. There are, for example, study clubs for workers of both sexes, study clubs for seminary and college students, study clubs for people of leisure, and study clubs for business people. Study circles are kept study circles by the emphasis which the Guild places on the earnestness of purpose required of every student. All things being equal, previous special training is rated of considerably less value than a zest for social study and a willingness to work hard and systematically. The organisation of each club is devised to combine system in procedure with informality of atmosphere. Sometimes a tutor, a person possessing superior knowledge of the subject in hand, guides the discussion. In default of a tutor, another Leader, as he is called, whether Director, President or Chairman, is chosen as the presiding officer. Other officers, such as secretary, may be elected at discretion. Classes, the numbers of which are usually restricted to a dozen or less, meet as a rule in a parish hall, or in the homes of the different members.

As regards the curriculum of the study circles, it is customary during the first two years for the club to take up Social Science and Economic History, sometimes beginning with the one, sometimes with the other. In this way, a foundation is laid for a more complete understanding of those specific social problems in which the students are likely to have a lively interest. The textbook method is in vogue, especially in those study clubs which have no tutor. The book is regularly read and discussed, assignments being made for home study, and members are encouraged to ask questions, offer criticisms and make comments. The study of a textbook is supplemented by written work on the part of the students, difficult as it sometimes is to get adults whose previous literary efforts have been confined to the writing of school "compositions," and the very poor, whose home surroundings and opportunities for leisure may not be conducive to such activity, to write weekly essays, or answers to questions,

on some phase of the social problem. Yet such outside exercises are deemed an invaluable part of the study club training, and a tactful Leader will deal gently with the halting and often painfully composed "home work" of his inarticulate and unpractised pupils. Individual specialisation, rather than individual dabbling, is encouraged, because it increases the amount of information "pooled" by the group and provides each student with an opportunity to pursue some definite hobby which he can make the starting point of wider reading and deeper knowledge.⁹²

The Catholic Social Guild gave aim, direction, and systematic coördination to the numerous social study clubs scattered throughout the country, by organising a study scheme which was first devised in the autumn of 1911 and formally inaugurated one year later. By this plan, definite courses of study are arranged, examiners appointed, and diplomas awarded to the successful candidates. This scheme of competitive study is open not only to study clubs, but to private students and to schools as well. The plan includes syllabi for both elementary and advanced courses, and covers the three designated divisions of the work, namely, Economic Theory, The Social and Economic History of England, and Some Social Problems of the Day, such as the living wage. It is customary to use one textbook,—Devas, for instance,—as a foundation, and supplement it by various books of reference. One of the most interesting features of the arrangement is the list of so-called Study-Points, or topics suggested for elaboration in the course.⁹³

The rapid growth of study circles was an indication that the Guild was already successful in fulfilling its avowed function of promoting the study of social questions along Catholic lines and facilitating communication between Catholic social students and workers. Like the Fabian Society, it was succeeding in its aim "to permeate." Inquiries for information about study clubs kept coming, not only from working men and women, but from teachers, nuns and priests all over the United Kingdom. Catholic organisations, like the diocesan Federations and the Catholic Young Men's Society, took up this work with great enthusiasm.

A new aid for students who encountered difficulties in their textbooks and collateral reading was to be found in the "Catholic Social Guild Question Box" which began to appear as a regular feature of the *Catholic Times*. Social students were invited to submit their difficulties to the editor, and were assured of carefully considered replies.⁹⁴

The acceptance of the generosity which was thus extended by the *Catholic Times* was a step in the direction of Catholic social correspondence classes. Correspondence tuition came, indeed, to be one of the concerns of the Guild. For the payment of a small fee, students are given the privilege of having their fortnightly papers, which they send by mail to a Catholic Social Guild tutor, corrected. Examination papers are obtained from the Secretary of the Guild. Certificates are issued to those who have passed a course in Social Science, and either Industrial History, Political Economy, Moral Philosophy, or International Relations, and *any* other subject chosen from the plan of study. Diplomas are awarded to those who have successfully completed work in Social Science and *two* of the other subjects mentioned, as well as in an additional course. To receive the Catholic Social Guild diploma, students of the Catholic Workers' College are permitted to substitute a pass in the examination for the Oxford University diploma in Economics and Political Science for either or both of the subjects, Industrial History and Political Economy.⁹⁵

The readers of this history of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain may be interested in knowing how one of the first study clubs projected by the Guild was conducted. "My Study Club," wrote Father Wright, in the September 27, 1911, issue of the *Catholic Times*, "consisted of five young fellows and myself. They were a keen set. They had not had the advantage of secondary education, but they undertook sociology and economics. . . . We have the syllabus of the Catholic Social Guild Study Scheme in front of us. We proceed to draw up our rules and to determine upon the subject we are to tackle. Our rules we cast in a free-and-easy mould; they are mainly two: (1) the appointment of a chairman, and (2) the appointment of a secretary.

The office of secretary resolves itself into supplying the club with the literature prescribed by the C. S. G. syllabus (and collecting the money for the defrayal of the debt incurred), and into notifying members of occasional alteration in date or place of meeting.

"The duty of the chairman—a position which might be held by the members in rotation—is to bring debate . . . back to the high road and to economise time by preventing too lengthy a disquisition on any single point. More rules we have not. . . . We are going in for Course A., i.e., Social and Economic Theory. . . . We are to meet once a fortnight, and for our next meeting we have all decided to read the first twenty-six pages of Dardano's *Elements of Social Science and Political Economy*. . . . The chairman reads the text as usual, and the rest punctuate his reading with questions and comments. We begin to perceive how the principles of sociology apply to our lives—our private life, our business life, our municipal life, and our national life—

" 'We will submit this matter to the editor of C. S. G. Question Box,' says the Chairman—He has a sharp eye for two things—he always manages somehow to get through the portion of the textbook fixed upon at the previous meeting, and he so orders the time at his disposal—I never knew him to fail—that the last fifteen minutes of each meeting may be given up to a soothing smoke and chat that is sociable rather than social. . . .

"Our six months of social study are finished and it is now the first week in July—the week of the C.S.G. examination. Three of our members—for we had lost one and the fourth is holiday making—stand for the examination. My study club has now completed its course." ⁹⁶

One of the Catholic Social Guild tutors writing for the Year Book for 1915 expressed a fear lest the remarkable advance made by the study clubs during the three years of their existence be checked by the War. This, he pointed out, would be a great disaster, for never before was there greater need for social knowledge nor more numerous opportunities for utilising it. Needless to say, the clubs survived the great upheaval, and, at present about one hundred thirty in number, with membership vary-

ing from five or six to even twenty or more, are in a flourishing condition in parishes, schools, Guild branches and other centers of Catholic social activity. The most effective work is done in the industrial parts of the North of England and Scotland, though there are lively groups in the Midlands, South Wales and London.⁹⁷

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Snead-Cox, J. G., *Life of Herbert Cardinal Vaughan*, 2 vols. (London, 1910); Vol. i, pp. 470, 477; *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 9 (1910-11), p. 685; *Tablet*, June 11, 1910. Gales, discussing Snead-Cox's biography of the Cardinal for the foregoing number of the *Hibbert Journal*, p. 684, expressed the opinion that Vaughan's "detachment" and "mortification" made him unattractive. In the reviewer's opinion, attractive people are those characterised by a childlike spontaneous naturalness—obviously not a characteristic of the third Archbishop of Westminster.

² These views were originally expressed in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. 10 (new series), 1868, pp. 131-165; the writer gave the subject fuller consideration in a pamphlet entitled *Popular Education in England: The Conscience Clause, the Rating Clause, and the Secular Current* (London, 1868).

³ Archbishop-elect of Westminster, *Claims of the Catholic School Committee to Catholic Support* (1892); Bishop of Salford, *A Letter on Our Present Evils and the Universal Jubilee* (1879), p. 14; *Times*, April 4, 1893; *Ibid.*, Oct. 31, 1893; *Ibid.*, Jan. 31, 1894; *Ibid.*, Feb. 2, 1894; *Ibid.*, Sept. 30, 1895; *Ibid.*, Dec. 18, 1895; *Ibid.*, Jan. 22, 1896; *Ibid.*, Jan. 24, 1896; *Ibid.*, Jan. 25, 1896; *Ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1896; *Ibid.*, Jan. 9, 1897; *Ibid.*, Nov. 2, 1897. In the autumn of 1894 Vaughan had taken steps to reverse the policy which had sought to prevent Catholic parents from sending their sons to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The ban was lifted. *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. xv, p. 314. Child welfare, apart from its technical educational aspects, appealed to Cardinal Vaughan. For example, he wrote a preface to the third edition of Maude and Leathley, *Outlines of the Law as to the Custody of Children* (London, 1894). Two years before this, the Wm. Barry had made a Report for Homes for Destitute Catholic Children, *Tablet*, Mar. 5, 1892. Toward the end of his life, Cardinal Vaughan opened in West Derby, Liverpool, a new school, which provided at the outset for 65 blind children. *Times*, Aug. 12, 1901. Meanwhile, he had saved the faith of numbers of Catholic children, which had as a rule been lost in the workhouses, by building Catholic Certified Homes. The Bishop was able to promise that every child handed over to a Catholic Home should cost the guardians considerably less than if it stayed in the workhouse. This was, of course, in consequence of the free services of members of religious orders.

⁴ Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 246, 249.

⁵ Bishop of Salford, *op. cit.*, p. 4; *Tablet*, Feb. 22, 1890.

⁶ Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 433, 436; *Tablet*, Apr. 10, 1897.

⁷ Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 434, 435. In an article contributed to the *Dublin Review* in 1893, pp. 801-813, James Halpin considered the relation of drink to social misery. In an article on The Licensing System and The Manchester Conference, written for another journal, the same writer quoted Cardinal Vaughan, who, when Bishop of Salford, had made a plea to the United Kingdom Alliance and similar associations to provide some immediate remedy for the drink evil. *Month*, Vol. 77 (1893), pp. 153, 154. At the Preston Conference in 1894, Dr. Mooney's paper on "Hindrances to Catholic Progress" was devoted chiefly to those which grew out of the drink traffic. *Ibid.*, Vol. 82 (1894).

⁸ Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 469; *Encyclical Letter of Leo XIII on St. Francis and the Propagation of the Third Order. Prefaced by a Letter from the Bishop of Salford* (Manchester and London, 1882); *The Catholic Church and the Living Wage* (London, 1893). In this compilation there appeared an article by Rev. Wm. Barry on "The Lesson of Chicago," taken from the *Catholic Times* and devoted to the need of a living wage.

⁹ *Tablet*, Feb. 2, 1890.

¹⁰ Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 430, 433.

¹¹ *Times*, Apr. 4, 1893.

¹² *Times*, Sept. 26, 1893; *Month*, Vol. 79 (1893), p. 331; *Humanitarian*, Vol. 3 (1893), pp. 401-410. For a criticism of Vaughan's speech, see *Westminster Review*, Vol. 141—new series 85—(1894). With reference to Vaughan's belief in the power of the Church to improve the lot of the people, W. R. Sullivan wrote (pp. 128, 129): "If this means that England, once well within the bounds of Papal jurisdiction, would have no social problem at all, it cannot be said that Continental experience justifies the prediction. . . . The idea that the Catholicism of the day produces deeper personal religion, more devoted philanthropy, or increased self-sacrifice amongst its professors at large, is not warranted by the plain teachings of experience in Catholic lands. It is conclusively shown that religion, and not creed, is at the root of the good done in England and abroad." A reflection of this sort opens a vista for much speculation, and conclusions can be drawn only in the light of a vast accumulation of data. One student of history could point with pride to the social conscience of Catholic Germany, whereas another, equally well-informed and not necessarily under the influence of a writer with the viewpoint of Professor Coulton, could not unfittingly ask if the Papal States were in all respects models of social progress under an ecclesiastical régime.

Since frequent mention will be made of the Catholic Truth Society, it might be well to explain the object of that organisation as it was explained by the Cardinal at the Portsmouth meeting. He said that its purpose was to instruct, amuse and edify the Catholic community, and especially the poor, by the publication of very cheap leaflets, booklets and fly-leaves, to present non-Catholics with an explanation of Catholic doctrine in cheap and accessible form, and to give the Catholic answer to many objections and deep-seated prejudices persistently held by the English mind. *Times*, *loc. cit.* The Catholic Truth Society gave frequent attention to social prob-

lems, both in its publications and at its conferences. For this reason it is frequently introduced.

¹³ *Tablet*, Dec. 16, 1893; Vaughan, H., *Lenten Pastoral on Five Current Topics* (1894), pp. 8, 9.

¹⁴ *Tablet*, Sept. 15, 1894; *Month*, Vol. 82 (1894), pp. 269-279. At the Preston meeting Canon Walmsley read a paper on "The Preston Guilds." In it he called attention to the fact that Preston was one of the oldest towns of Saxon Lancashire and preëminently the Guild town, the most Catholic town in England. "The Guilds," he wrote, "are composed chiefly of the Catholic artisans and operatives; of those by whose mechanical skill and patient attention the conclusions of science and art are applied to the production of food and clothing. Like the ancient Guilds, their constitution is essentially religious." *Tablet*, Sept. 15, 1894. In 1899, at the Stockport Conference, Cardinal Vaughan spoke at length on the work of the Catholic Social Union. He declared that in the five years of its life it had wrought great social and religious improvement among the people. *Times*, Aug. 29, 1899. A writer in the *Dublin Review* in the year 1894 was among those beginning to raise their voices in behalf of curative social reform, instead of merely palliative almsgiving. "Men in power and authority," he wrote, "wax eloquent when debating upon the necessity of charity to the distressed and sympathy with the sons of toil; they are even ready and anxious to loosen the purse-strings of the philanthropic and to lessen actual pressure by timely doles. This is all very well in its way, but it is no solution to the social question. The masses want justice rather than intermittent charity, and they will never be satisfied till they get it." *Dublin Review*, Vol. 114 (1894), p. 45.

¹⁵ *Tablet*, Mar. 28, 1896.

¹⁶ *Times*, Aug. 29, 1899; *Ibid.*, Aug. 31, 1899; *Month*, Vol. 94 (1899), p. 345; *Ibid.*, Vol. iii (1908), p. 36.

¹⁷ *Tablet*, Feb. 6, 1892; *Times*, Aug. 29, 1899; *Ibid.*, Oct. 2, 1899.

¹⁸ Rogers, F., *Labour, Life and Literature. Some Memories of Sixty Years*. (London, 1913), p. 246.

¹⁹ *Times*, Sept. 27, 1893; *Ibid.*, July 1, 1897; *Ibid.*, Nov. 24, 1899; *Ibid.*, Apr. 15, 1899; *Times*, Mar. 20, 1899.

²⁰ *Month*, Vol. 90 (1897), p. 132.

²¹ Archbishop Bourne, Vaughan's successor, did not regard the Act, however, as a final solution of the problem. Obviously a great improvement over that of 1870, it still in his opinion afforded a privileged position to secularists and nonconformists. The voluntary schools were still at a financial disadvantage compared with those backed by the public purse. *Times*, Sept. 27, 1904. For the last years of Cardinal Vaughan, see *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 15, p. 314.

²² *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, Vols. 5 and 6 (Aug., 1913), p. 125.

²³ *Times*, June 21, 1900; *Tablet*, June 23, 1900.

²⁴ *Tablet*, Dec. 8, 1900.

²⁵ *Times*, Sept. 12, 1901.

²⁶ *Tablet*, June 14, 1902.

²⁷ *Tablet*, July 11, 1903; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, pp. 87, 88;

Picht, W., *Toynbee Hall and the English Settlements* (London, 1914), pp. 112, 113, 218-219.

²⁸ *Tablet*, Jan. 30, 1904. *Times*, Sept. 29, 1904. During this time, Catholics were coöperating in work for the deserving poor by their presence on Boards of Guardians, *Times*, July 13, 1905.

²⁹ *Tablet*, Sept. 30, 1905.

³⁰ *Tablet*, Sept. 14, 1907, p. 433. Writing after the Catholic Social Guild had come into existence, Mrs. Crawford continued her strictures on the apathetic attitude of Catholics. She wrote, for example: ". . . of our well-to-do Catholic girls it has been asserted, not without truth, that in their conception of life they seem to arrive at no via media between a religious vocation and extreme frivolity." *Catholic World*, Vol. 95 (1912), p. 480.

³¹ Masterman, Charles F. G., and others, *The Heart of the Empire* (London, 1907), p. 39.

³² Report from Weekly Despatch published in *Tablet*, Jan. 25, 1908. In a speech which he made in 1908, Father Vaughan declared that every industrial worker in England had the right to something better than "a sweated wage, a sweated rent, and a sweated life" and demanded that the Sweated Industries Bill, which was designed to improve the conditions of employment and establish a legal minimum wage, become a law. *Tablet*, Feb. 1, 1908.

³³ *Catholic Mind*, Vol. 5 (1907), pp. 210, 211.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 212.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 212, 214.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

³⁷ Crawford, V. M., *Ideals of Charity* (London, 1908), p. 10.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-13.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-27.

⁴⁰ *Month*, Vol. cxi (1908), pp. 113-119.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 119. The same author contributed an article to this periodical for September, 1908, in which he emphasised the need for "Social Work in Catholic Schools" to bring boys to the realisation that the education they were receiving was not only for their own benefit, but also for that of others. His article in the December number was devoted to "Social Work After Leaving School." In it he placed the regeneration of the masses above all other social needs. For this work it was personal service, not money, that was wanted.

⁴³ *Month*, Vol. 113 (1909), p. 188 *et seq.*

⁴⁴ *Tablet*, Sept. 25, 1909. Earlier in the year an article had appeared in the *Month*—Vol. 113 (1909)—describing the interest which Catholics had shown in the reform of the existing Poor Laws.

⁴⁵ *The Church and Labour* (London, 1908), *passim*.

⁴⁶ Norris, J., *The Help of the Laity*; Devas, B. W., *Work in the Hop-Gardens*. A despatch from England at the opening of the hop-picking season of 1925 stated that "State Charity and religion have combined to make the hopper's work as easy as possible" and mentioned concerts among the attractions provided (*New York Times*, Aug. 25, 1925). *The Catholic*

Social Year Book for 1912, compiled six years after the Bishop of Southwark had entrusted the spiritual care of Catholic hoppers to the Capuchin Order, in recounting what had been achieved, alluded to the evening concerts given once or twice a week, and wrote that it was admitted on all sides that there was far less drink and bad language and rowdy conduct than a few years before, and the Catholic mission had largely contributed to that happy result. (pp. 70, 71).

⁴⁷ Plater, Charles, *Retreats for Workers*, pp. 1-4.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 5.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7; pp. 17, 18.

⁵⁰ Martindale, C., *Study Clubs for Working-Men*, pp. 1-17.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁵² *Catholic Mind*, Vol. 6 (1908), pp. 175-178.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 179-182.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁵⁵ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919 (London), pp. 1, 2; Martindale, C., *Charles Dominic Plater* (London, 1922), p. 112; *Catholic World*, Vol. 95 (1912), pp. 478, 479; *America*, July 9, 1910.

⁵⁶ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, pp. 2, 3.

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 113, 114.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-85.

⁵⁹ *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 7 (1908-1909), pp. 49-62. It was not surprising that the Retreat idea became a prominent feature of the Guild. Early in its history it proudly recorded that of the thousands of men and women who made retreats every year, the majority belonged to the working class. *Catholic Social Guild Leaflets*, No. 3, p. 3. Father Plater wrote a number of pamphlets on the subject, such as *Retreats for the People: A Sketch of a Great Revival*; *Retreats for Workers and Working Men as Evangelists*. *Ibid.*, p. 4. Plater and Father William Doyle, the beloved chaplain who died in the war, corresponded much on the subject of workers' retreats, which Father Doyle believed could be profitably introduced in Ireland. O'Rahilly, A., *Father William Doyle* (London, etc., 1922), pp. 77, 79.

⁶⁰ Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 108-111.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, Ch. 13, *passim*.

⁶² *Ibid.*, Ch. 10, *passim*.

⁶³ *Catholic Times and Catholic Opinion*, Nov. 25, 1922. This quotation is taken from an appreciation by Canon William Barry. The source of other data on the life and work of Plater is Martindale's scholarly biography. Regarding Plater's relations with the Guild, Barry wrote, "to the Catholic Social Guild he furnished an untamable energy, like fire creative and far-shining."

⁶⁴ *Times*, June 23, 1924; *Tablet*, June 28, 1924.

⁶⁵ *Catholic Who's Who and Year Book* (London, 1926), pp. 167, 168, 103, 187. Among others present on that historic occasion were Miss Ada Streeter, a woman prominently identified with various women's organisations; the German Benedictine scholar, Dom Lambert Nolle; Mr. C. Elliott Anstruther, writer and lecturer; Alexander Mooney of Preston, physician and writer on

social questions; Bertrand Devas, son of Charles Stanton Devas; and Mr. Byrne, President of the Catholic Young Men's Society. *Ibid.*, pp. 459, 460, pp. 353, 7, 8, 331; *Ibid.*, 1910, pp. 93, 47.

⁶⁹ Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 114, 269, 270; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, p. 4; (Catholic) *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 16 (1909), pp. 661, 662; *Times*, Sept. 22, 1909; *Tablet*, Sept. 25, 1909; *Month*, Vol. 114 (1909), pp. 449-460.

⁶⁷ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, p. 4; *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Supplement, p. 169.

⁶⁸ *Catholic Book Notes*, Jan. 15, 1910.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, Feb. 21, 1910; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, p. 415; Martindale, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-272.

⁷⁰ Martindale, *loc. cit.*; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, p. 5. An American Catholic periodical, reviewing this volume, declared it to be one of the most practical and useful manuals of Catholic social activity that had ever come to its notice. (Catholic) *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 17 (1910), p. 238.

⁷¹ Martindale, *op. cit.*, pp. 273-277.

⁷² *America*, Vol. 3 (1910), p. 329.

⁷³ *Tablet*, Aug. 20, 1910, p. 310.

⁷⁴ *Month*, Vol. 118 (1911), pp. 137-148; *Ibid.*, Vol. 116 (1910), pp. 364-373. As far back as 1897, Father George Tyrrell had declared that the priest was bound to interest himself in the social question because of its direct bearing on the ethical and religious development of mankind. "The priest," he wrote, "is one destined to the service of man, and of the whole man, body and soul. Nor is his ministry merely to individuals singly, but to all collectively, to society, to the State. He differs from other public men in that he views secular problems explicitly in their bearing on morals and religion from a higher standpoint; and in the methods which he uses, which are, as a rule, individual and confined to the category of moral, rather than of political or material power. When, however, we consider the social problem in the light of those spiritual interests which are the priest's highest, if not always his most immediate concern, indifference to it becomes still less excusable." *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. 22 (1897), pp. 152-155.

⁷⁵ Plater, C., *Priest and Social Action* (London, 1914), *passim*.

⁷⁶ *The Irish Catholic*, May 11, 1912.

⁷⁷ *Catholic Times*, Dec. 27, 1912; *Catholic Who's Who and Year Book*, 1925, pp. 319, 320; Milligan, G., *Life Through Labour's Eyes* (London, 1911), *passim*; *Catholic Times*, Jan. 31, 1913. Milligan, who was also the editor of a little labour paper called *The Mersey* made a plea for the Christian solution of social problems, in a paper which he read, on "The Rights of Man," at the Catholic Truth Conference in Dublin in October, 1913. (Dublin, 1913).

⁷⁸ *Month*, Vol. 121 (1913), pp. 33-43.

⁷⁹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, *passim*. Since for several years each successive Year Book dealt with a selected number of such activities, stating their aims and methods, giving a few notes on their history and adding an estimate of their relation to broader developments, it would not be irrele-

vant to mention by name some of these more restricted Catholic works; for example, The Third Order of Saint Francis and Its Social Work; Work for Catholic Sailors; Catholic Prisoners' Aid Society; The Crusade of Rescue, devoted to the social salvaging of little children and the young; The Catholic Medical Guild; The Saint Vincent de Paul Society; The Catholic Federations; and The Catholic Guardians' Association, which has accomplished a great deal in its avowed purpose of removing the children of all creeds as far as possible from the influence of the Poor Law and its surroundings. A guide to these activities is the *Handbook of Catholic Charitable and Social Works*, a C. T. S. publication.

⁸⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1913, pp. 99-101.

⁸¹ Of stimulating interest to Catholic Social Students was the Year Book for 1923 called *A Handbook for Social Study*, a volume which owed much to its predecessor of 1920. No mention was made in the text of the Year Books for 1921 and 1925, because the topics with which they dealt,—the Catholic Workers' College at Oxford, and Catholics and the Problem of Peace,—will receive detailed consideration in other connections.

⁸² *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Supplement, p. 169.

⁸³ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, p. 10; Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, p. 272; (Catholic) *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 18, Feb., 1911. Although the high cost of living advanced the price of these pamphlets from one penny to two pence, they continued to be popular. Not only such subjects as Catholic social work and Catholic social principles were discussed in their various phases by numerous writers, but also the problems arising from relationships within the family. Such, for example, was the Archbishop of Liverpool's pamphlet on Divorce and Bertram Wolfertan's *Duties of Parents Towards Their Children*. All this pamphlet literature was published by the Catholic Truth Society.

⁸⁴ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1919, pp. 11, 12; Martindale, *op. cit.*, pp. 296, 297; *New Statesman*, Sept. 6, 1913. The fifth volume, on *First Notions in Social Service*, edited by Mrs. Philip Gibbs, was designed for the use of schools and colleges, and for all beginners in social work. The sixth was devoted to *Christian Citizenship*, the seventh to *The Drink Question*. The eighth of the series, by Margaret Fletcher, on *Christian Feminism*, was highly praised for its eminently practical character.

⁸⁵ Crawford, V. M., *The Church and the Worker*, *passim*.

⁸⁶ Martindale, *The Gospel and the Citizen* (Fourth impression), p. 48.

⁸⁷ Keating, J., and Parker, A., *Questions of the Day*; Watt, L., *Elements of Economics*.

⁸⁸ *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 12 (1913), p. 208.

⁸⁹ *New Statesman*, Aug. 2, 1913. A textbook which made an equally fine impression on the English public was the *Primer of Peace and War* edited by Father Plater. This volume will be noted when the relations of English Catholics to the movement for world peace is discussed. Another useful textbook was *A Synopsis of Devas' Political Economy*, which was edited by C. D. Hugo, of the English Dominican Province (London, 1915).

⁹⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, pp. 50-52; Martindale, C. Charles Dominic Plater, p. 272; *Catholic World*, Vol. 95 (1912), p. 485. *Catholic*

Social Year Book, 1923, p. 43. The Catholic Truth Society further co-operates with the Catholic Social Guild in the work of circulating social literature by placing such volumes for sale in church door boxes and putting them on display after lectures delivered on social topics under Catholic Truth Society auspices. *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, pp. 52-55.

⁹¹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, p. 52; *Ibid.*, 1919, p. 49.

⁹² Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, Ch. xiii, *passim*; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, pp. 52-55; *Ibid.*, 1911, pp. 56-62; *Ibid.*, 1920, pp. 1-3; *Ibid.*, 1923, pp. 7-36; *Catholic World*, Vol. 95 (1912), pp. 485, 486; *Month*, Vol. 120 (1912), pp. 141-151; *Catholic Social Guild Leaflet*, No. 4 ("How to Organise a Study Circle"). Much of the usefulness of study circles results from their informality and susceptibility to innovation. In 1912, for example, Saint Augustine's Study Club opened its meetings to non-members, these silent listeners being thereby enabled to acquire valuable information. *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, p. 11.

⁹³ Wright, L., *The Catholic Social Guild Study Scheme* (Liverpool, 1912); *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, pp. 6-9. Leaflets drawn up by the Guild are available, showing the amount of variation which may exist among these excellently devised study schemes. For example, the syllabus of preliminary Course C for January to July, 1912, developed the topic "Sweated Labour and Destitution" as its selection from the "Social Problems of the Day."

⁹⁴ Wright, L., *op. cit.*, pp. 11, 12.

⁹⁵ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1923, pp. 42, 43, pp. 26, 27.

⁹⁶ *America*, Vol. 8 (1912, 1913), p. 47.

⁹⁷ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1915, pp. 34-39; *Ibid.*, 1926, pp. 74-79. Also statistics supplied by the secretary of the Catholic Social Guild in February, 1927.

CHAPTER V

THE EXPANSION OF CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION

CATHOLIC SOCIAL ACTION ON THE EVE OF THE WAR

From the time of the formation of the Catholic Social Guild to the outbreak of the War, English Catholics continued their wonted interest in social questions, both in connection with the Guild and independently of its activities. Sometimes there was coöperation between the Guild and other bodies, such as that which took place each year at the National Catholic Congresses, which convened for the first time at Leeds in 1910. During the period under survey, clergy and laity contributed articles to periodicals on various phases of the social question, and Catholic Trade Unionists and others engaged in concerted efforts to better the condition of their groups.

Emily C. Fortey, writing for the *Crucible* in the summer of 1910, made a powerful appeal for the training of social workers, that they might be equipped to make use of the scientific method in dealing with the problem of poverty. She drew attention to the fact that, whereas people recognised the futility of putting an untrained person in a chemical laboratory and expecting him to carry on experiments, they had little hesitation about sending into the slums workers unprepared to face the yet more complicated problems to be found there. She also took occasion to attack the practice of injudicious almsgiving. Promiscuous charity of this sort, however popular it might be with certain modern Catholics, was, she made clear, quite out of accord with the custom of the bishops of the early church and the teachings of the Church Fathers and had played no part in the famous society founded by Frederic Ozanam. Not only social workers,

but citizens taking their places on responsible public bodies should, she asserted, be grounded in economics, sociology and ethics.¹

Mrs. Crawford, in her *Ideals of Charity*, offered suggestions as to where social workers could be trained. She herself had profited by attending lectures at the London School of Economics, which was part of the University of London. For those who required less thorough and less strenuous training she recommended courses of lectures at the School of Sociology and Social Economics conducted in coöperation with the Charity Organisation Society. The Charity Organisation Society itself, in spite of certain limitations, offered a valuable apprenticeship in social training through work in its district offices. Social workers in search of information could apply with profit to the British Institute of Social Service. The Woman's Institute filled a distinct need for the training of secretaries and as a center for the dissemination of knowledge regarding women's work and progress. For practical information, especially of a nature desired by voluntary workers, she recommended the Home Arts and Industries Association.²

Catholic social students participated in the National Congresses which came to be an annual feature of Catholic life in England. At Leeds in 1910 the Guild obtained dignified publicity and held three meetings, the first in union with the Catholic Truth Society and the Catholic Women's League, the second a members' meeting, and the third one open to the general public. These occasions, however, did not exhaust its influence on the Congress. The Guild played a part in several of the sectional meetings held by various societies, and was brought to the attention of Catholic Federationists, Catholic Trade Unionists and Catholic Women's organisations. The cause of social reform for which it had come into being was urged on many other occasions, as when the Bishop of Northampton, for example, made it the subject of his sermon in the cathedral at Leeds.³

Among the many papers read at the Leeds Conference was one on "Catholic Social Work," by Mrs. Philip Gibbs. She insisted that we must act as if social evils were remediable, and

called upon her coreligionists to wake up and make their distinctive contribution. They must not fail to profit by the experience of others, she said, and should join the great army of non-Catholic social workers wherever work was being done for the relief of poverty, or the inculcation of moral principles. Catholic representatives should, she held, be found on every social reform committee, even when they could not agree with all the methods employed, or all the ideals embodied in its schemes. She reminded her audience that conditions had changed and that democracy had come to stay. If Catholicism was also to stay, she declared, the democracy must be Christian.⁴

At Norwich, in 1912, Cardinal Bourne, when congratulating the Catholic Social Guild on the prominent part it had played in the deliberations of the annual Conference, urged that every Catholic lend his whole-hearted support to the Guild. The members of the Guild, he reminded his audience, had had the courage to engage in pioneer work, and pioneers, he went on to say, had to make their way on an untrodden path and might take a wrong turn. He had no reason to believe, he said, that the Guild had taken a wrong turn or made any mistakes, but, if a difficulty should arise, it might prove disastrous should they withdraw their confidence from its work.⁵

So successful had been the sectional meetings of the Guild at previous Congresses that in 1913 the Permanent Committee gave it the opportunity to organise the Saturday afternoon mass-meeting, which was held in the Guildhall, the largest auditorium in Plymouth. A large and enthusiastic audience listened to a number of prominent speakers give expression to "The Catholic Demand for a Living Wage." The Bishop of Northampton denounced the "vile and unjust" conditions under which most workers were forced to live. Mr. Thomas Burns and Mr. George Milligan, speaking from the standpoint of Trade Unionists, gave testimony based on personal experiences, to the actual need for the new wage. The workers' distress was emphasised still further by two women representatives of sweated industries who, in short speeches, touching in their simplicity, brought the question of

a living wage out of the realm of the academic into the domain of pathetic reality. On the occasion of the Plymouth meeting, Cardinal Bourne again spoke words of kind encouragement to the Guild.⁶

It was at Plymouth also that the Cardinal made the interesting statement that the question had come up sometimes as to how far Catholics ought to unite with non-Catholics in those general movements that affected the welfare of the people as a whole. He had never hesitated, he said, even in Rome itself, to give the opinion that, whatever might be the case in countries where the bulk of the population was Catholic, in England the only way that Catholics could gain influence in any great movement was to participate directly in it.⁷

Cardinal Bourne made these remarks when addressing the Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists. This organisation must not be confused with the Catholic Trade Unions to be found in some of the other countries of Europe, where it is customary for Catholics to set up trade unions open only to Catholics. In England the trade unions are not organised along religious lines. Catholic workers, however, while remaining active members of their respective unions, had established a Conference for the consideration of those special problems which confronted them as Catholics. At a time when the mass of Catholic workers were unorganised and apathetic in the face of the threatened de-Christianisation of democracy, Dr. Casartelli, the Bishop of Salford, while addressing a mass-meeting in Manchester, declared, in substance, that the time had arrived for the Catholic Trade Unionist to reconsider his position. It was in response to this encouragement from high quarters that the new organisation sprang up. The first meeting of Catholic Trade Unionists had been held at Manchester, in 1908. Two years later a Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists, organised by the Trade Union sub-committee of the Catholic Federation in the Salford Diocese, was formally inaugurated "for the purpose of safeguarding the Catholic interests of the Catholic members of the Trade Union and Labour movements."⁸

At the Catholic Congress held at Newcastle the Catholic Trade Unionists protested against the recent secular trend in education. A year later, at Norwich, Cardinal Bourne told the same group that he had gladly acceded to the request of the bishops to act as ecclesiastical superior to the National Conference of Catholic Trade Unions. It was incumbent upon every good Catholic trade unionist, he said, to recognise the binding force of the Ten Commandments and the rights of other men—the rights of employers of labour, for example. Regarding strikes and lockouts, he held that the good to be gained by such measures must be of sufficient magnitude to compensate for injury done to those not directly engaged in the struggle.⁹

Mr. Thomas F. Burns, Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Trade Unions, welcomed the Catholic Social Guild which, he foresaw, would be instrumental in bringing a knowledge of Catholic social principles to Catholic Trade Union members, and through them to the attention of Trade Union Congresses and Labour Party Conferences. He believed that for the lack of such a leavening influence the Socialist viewpoint would dominate the economic counsels of these meetings, and the religious atmosphere which enveloped them would be the exclusive creation of Church of England and Nonconformist bodies. Early in its history the Conference of Catholic Trade Unionists set its face against such policies as collectivism, relaxation of the divorce law and exclusively secular education. In 1914 the Conference was laying general plans for the formation of an international organisation of Catholic trade unionists, but a preliminary meeting, scheduled to be held at Lucerne in August of that year, was prevented from taking place by the outbreak of the War. After the Catholic Trade Unionist organisation had won its fight against the divorce and secular education resolutions which came up year by year at the Trade Union Congresses, it passed out of existence.¹⁰

The attitude of Catholic Trade Unionists and other Catholics toward the problem of education was not restricted to a vigilance lest the schools conducted under religious auspices be discrimin-

ated against, or their very existence jeopardised, or Catholic teachers made to suffer in any way. Catholic schools were expected to take a prominent part in the training of social workers, and one writer, Father Wright, did not hesitate to express the opinion that the responsibility for making a Catholic social programme effective rested with the Catholic Education Authorities. Sociology, he held, should be taught in seminaries and colleges, in order to fit each graduate to take in the world "a man's full share of duty." In 1913 the Catholic Teachers Conference passed resolutions condemning the principle of contracting out, and demanding equality of educational opportunity for every child in the kingdom.¹¹

Other interests of Catholic social reformers were receiving attention at the outbreak of the War. For instance, the appeal for boys' clubs, to which timorous expression had been given in the nineteenth century, took the form of a confident and successful agitation in the twentieth. Catholic Boys' Clubs sprang up all over the country to rescue boys from the dangers that dogged their steps after they left school to become wage-earners. Bertrand Devas and James Britten gave thoughtful consideration to the problems of these clubs. Mr. Devas laid stress on the need for a responsible head for each club and declared that the value of such an organisation lay in its power to provide a meeting place for friends and an opportunity to form new acquaintances. Mr. Britten, whose observations were based on some twenty years personal experience in boys' clubs, emphasised the indispensable importance of sympathy and tact in dealing with boys, but warned of the disappointment in store for those who expected effusive expressions of gratitude in return for kindness shown. A general benevolence which catered indiscriminately for large numbers had usually resulted in the predominance of the bad element over the group of good and steady boys. The rule of total abstinence must be enforced and encouragement given to the cultivation of a taste for reading. Mr. Britten dilated on the advantages which would accrue from the democratic management of boys' clubs. Regarding the important question of re-

ligious influences, both he and Mr. Devas were convinced that if the religious element were clumsily obtruded, the boys would be repulsed, but if subtly introduced, it was capable of doing an immeasurable amount of good.¹²

The subject of Temperance also had its innings during those pre-war years. The Rev. Edward Somers, writing in the *Tablet* in 1911, assailed the notorious intemperance of Great Britain as a vulgar vice full of menace to the vitality and continuance of the race. In his opinion, teetotalism was a desperate remedy for a desperate disease, but, unfortunately, for a large number of Englishmen, an absolute necessity. The Bishop of Salford, early in 1912, asked if Catholics were doing all that they might do in the crusade against drink and the promotion of temperance. He had an uneasy feeling that since the days of Cardinal Manning and Father Nugent, Catholic energies had slackened in that important work. Recent statistics, he pointed out, had raised a hope that the nation was becoming more sober, but he doubted if the improvement were sufficiently great to justify a relaxation of effort.¹³

In 1914, Father Bede Jarrett, the eloquent Dominican preacher, published a book on *St. Antonino and Mediaeval Economics*. In it he recounted the life and good works of the great Archbishop of Florence, whose writings on social and political questions contain valuable suggestions for the settlement of social problems by the principles of truth and justice which, in the opinion of this recent biographer, may bear fruit in our own time.¹⁴

Shortly before the fateful decision which brought Great Britain into the War, Cardinal Bourne, in addressing the annual meeting of the Catholic Union, spoke of the Social Problem. The most prominent questions of the day and those that imperatively called for some solution were, he declared, the ending of the labour difficulties, the existing differences between workers and employers and the rights of capital and labour. He indicated the duty of Catholics to take upon themselves their share of the burden of solving the social problem which loomed so large all over the world. The Cardinal gave as his opinion that the social

revolution which accompanied and assisted the religious changes of the sixteenth century gave birth to the principle of individualism, which lay at the root of the difficulties of his day.¹⁵

CARRYING ON IN WAR TIME AND DAYS OF READJUSTMENT

It was important that there should be no relaxation of social study and social action during the critical days of the War and the equally trying times that followed. It was rather necessary that efforts should be redoubled to meet the abnormal conditions produced by the infinitely complex series of events, some radiated in the distant past, which in 1914 pitted two groupings of European nations against each other in a struggle which threatened to destroy the best of what both had given to the world. Loyally and effectively the Catholics of Great Britain took up their share of the appalling burden.¹⁶

The *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1915 was devoted to the War and the problems to which it gave rise. The first Section developed the idea that the conflict in which England was engaged was a just one, irrespective of the lower motives that might also be present. The second Section was devoted to practical considerations. Catholics were urged to coöperate in every way with efforts to lessen the strain of the abnormal times in which they were living, and bring comfort to those who were sorrowing. The editors were able to rise above the passions engendered by the War, and, speaking a good word for the German people, urged a humane attitude toward them: " . . . we hope one day to be friends with the Germans again. May we be able to look them in the face, conscious that we have fought them like Christians and gentlemen." The editors further pleaded that the Germans living in England be not subjected to petty persecution.¹⁷

Sections of the same book were devoted to such topics as the moral dangers of war time and the breakdown of international morality. Father Bernard Vaughan wrote on "War and the Spirit of Self-Sacrifice," a spirit, which, he emphasised, must not end with the War. "We must be prepared," he wrote, "when the war

shall have been fought through to victory, to face the war to be waged against social wrongs.”¹⁸

An appeal was made in the Year Book for an increased membership of Catholic Boy Scouts to carry on such activities as delivering messages to public authorities, assisting in the reception of refugees from France and Belgium, and substituting in business offices for the clerks who had enlisted. Under the caption, “Labour Disputes in 1914,” the statement was made that but for the War, the year 1914 might have seen industrial disputes even more acute than those of the three preceding years. Mr. Somerville, the writer of this article, recorded as a significant development the recent organisation of miners, railway men and transport workers into the “Labour Triple Alliance.”¹⁹

In the early days of the War there arose the question of the ethics of strikes in war time. Two representative Catholic leaders, Archbishop John A. Maguire of Glasgow and Mr. George Miligan, gave their views on this important question. In introducing the carefully considered pronouncements of these two gentlemen, the *Catholic Social Guild Bulletin* made the following comment: “What the critics of the working classes are apt to forget is that excessive over-time, carried on over long weeks, is bound to produce a reaction, and beyond certain limits must always prove a mistaken policy . . . it is notorious that Government contractors of all kinds make huge profits in war time, and there is no reason to suppose that this war will prove an exception. Yet is it more unpatriotic of the workers, suffering from the high price of food, to seek to have a share in these abnormal profits, than for the capitalists to earn them?”²⁰

The Archbishop, in his protest against the unjust attack made by the conservative element and its mouthpieces on the Clydesbank engineers, wrote: “The men are ‘chaffering for a farthing an hour’ (By the way, this sum is a rhetorical misstatement). Are not the masters also chaffering? Why should the men only be censured? It may be said—because they have moved, gone on strike. But the masters do not need to move; they have only to sit still, their profits go on and wages do not increase unless

the men strike. The masters are ready enough to use their special weapon—a lockout—when it suits them. It would not suit them just now. They want work to go on briskly and to produce good dividends, without having to pay high wages. . . . Most of the masters and shareholders would be very little inconvenienced even if food prices should rise further and their dividends be somewhat reduced. As things are, there may be the trouble of looking out for new investments for surplus profits. We do not at present observe any very stringent economy in the lives of the comfortable classes of Glasgow and its suburbs.”²¹

Mr. Milligan, curiously enough, expressed his espousal of the cause of the workers in somewhat milder terms than those which had been employed by his Grace the Archbishop. “Certainly,” he wrote, “it is no time for disputes in the industrial world when the country is fighting in the greatest fight history has ever known. . . . But when food and the cost of living go up in the interest of commercial profit—the voice of the workers demands its meed of justice. . . . Popular opinion is in favour of better wages, but believes that this should be gained without any cessation of work. Of course, if employers remain obdurate against reasonable claims, there is only one means of keeping the peace,—that is, Government intervention.”²²

The Catholic Social Guild edited a practical pamphlet entitled *How to Help the Belgian Refugees*. Physical necessities, it was pointed out, should first be attended to, and efforts made to keep people of the same class and occupation together and in touch with the corresponding groups in England. The custom of “treating” the visitors to strong drink was condemned, as was also the widespread tendency to spoil them by too many social attentions and over-much fussing. It was further urged that the refugees be provided with suitable occupations as far as this could be accomplished without endangering the interests of British workers. A number of the Catholic Social Guild study clubs took up the problem raised by the presence of these foreign guests, and were able to offer to the local authorities valuable suggestions for its solution. The Catholic Women’s League and other

Catholic groups assisted in the housing and entertainment of the refugees.²³

The matter of soldiers' recreation became a serious concern of public-spirited Catholics. On the occasion of the opening of the Soldiers' Recreation Hut at Park Hall Camp, the Bishop of Shrewsbury, who said that he considered the hardships of the soldier's life entitled him to reasonable recreation, thanked the Catholic Women's League for having done so much for the men in this respect. Both the Bishop and Mrs. James Hope, the President of the League, emphasised the fact that the Hut was not exclusively for Catholics. Sir Francis Lloyd declared that the Catholic Women's League Hut near the Cathedral in Westminster was one of the best run in London. The same organisation set up three huts in France which became extremely popular.²⁴

On June 9, 1917, the Catholic Social Guild held a Conference especially organised to consider methods of caring for discharged and disabled soldiers. Father Plater, who presided, made a number of suggestions in a paper entitled "How to Help Catholic Soldiers." He stressed the point that soldiers should be helped to secure the insurance and pensions to which they were entitled, because, as he explained, they frequently did not know their own rights in these matters.²⁵

The Guild got out a leaflet called *The War on Waste* which was designed to bring to a saner state of mind those people who, having profited economically by the War, were spending their unaccustomed gains with reckless extravagance. The appeal for retrenchment was made not only on the grounds of public welfare, but on the grounds of self-interest as well. It was pointed out that any prosperity that resulted from war-time industries was bound to be transient and would collapse with the end of the War. The workers were urged to put their extra earnings in postal savings banks and to encourage the practice of thrift among their children. "If your young children are earning good money," advised the Guild, "put some of it aside for them for the hard times that will come. You do not want to see them go under

when the War is over. You will have to keep them in clothes and boots and food while they are *learning new work*.”²⁶

Cardinal Bourne's Lenten Pastoral for the year 1918 was devoted to *The Nation's Crisis*. "It is admitted on all hands," he wrote, "that a new order of things, new social conditions, new relations between the different sections into which society is divided, will arise as a consequence of the destruction of the formerly existing situation. . . . During the war the minds of the people have been profoundly altered. Dull acquiescence in social injustice has given way to active discontent. The very foundations of political and social life, of our economic system, of morals and religion, are being sharply scrutinised; and this not only by a few writers and speakers, but by a very large number of people in every class of life, especially among the workers. Our institutions, it is felt, must justify themselves at the bar of reason; they can no longer be taken for granted." He alluded to the new interest in Catholicism which had arisen in England during the War, and saw in this, as well as in the intrinsic merits of Catholic social principles, a splendid opportunity for Catholics to play a constructive part in building up the new social order.²⁷

Father Plater, who had taken upon himself the task of keeping Catholic soldiers at the front posted on developments in England, wrote enthusiastically of the Cardinal's Pastoral and urged the men to read it for themselves. He added exhortations of his own. In his third Letter to a Catholic Soldier, he wrote: "How many of you have told me that you will put a stop to profiteering and clear out corrupt politicians and make an end of jobbery, injustice and sham. You say that men must no longer be treated like machines and housed like swine.

"That is right. Come back with big ideas and broad minds and high hopes. But don't think that these reforms can be won by mass meetings and big talk. They must be *worked for*.

". . . just as you drilled your body for war, so you must drill your mind for peace. Very few people *think*. You must give them a lead.

". . . talk over this letter with one or two other Catholic boys

and arrange to meet at regular times and get your brains to work on these subjects.”²⁸

The *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1915 devoted a section to “Moral Dangers of War-Time.” It stated that, while governments were taking measures to protect soldiers from the drink evil, the military authorities had not shown themselves sufficiently alert in fighting another danger to which soldiers were exposed, that of sexual irregularities, especially prostitution. The article urged that innocent amusements be provided for the men at the front and that they be fortified by all the religious and moral aids which could be mustered in their behalf.²⁹

Early in the War an organisation was formed, The Temperance Council of the Christian Churches, to combat the drink evil. Cardinal Bourne, who was one of its presidents, expressed at various meetings his strong conviction that the legal restrictions which had been placed on the liquor traffic during the War should not be relaxed with the coming of peace. At a meeting held a few days before the Armistice, the Cardinal, in summarising the conclusions to which the members of the Council had come—among them the necessity for the limitation of public houses and the restriction of hours for business and the encouragement of local option—gave as his opinion that of all the recommendations which had been made, the most important was that for the provision of recreational alternatives for the social attractions of the drink shop.³⁰

The other danger to which soldiers and civilians were exposed was prostitution. Much has been spoken and written in extenuation of this evil and much in its condemnation, but perhaps the viewpoint most far-reaching and insidious in its consequences is that which counsels acquiescence in its existence as a necessary evil—an opinion to which Lecky gave egregiously sentimental expression. Since public opinion is more terrifying—because less remote—than the wrath of God, society’s complacency regarding this problem has been but a connivance with human weakness to bring ruin to the individual and pollution to the race.

Of late years, certain elements have been at work to clear the

atmosphere and modify the attitude just mentioned. Leaders of the feminist movement have protested against the injustice to women inherent in the tolerance of this institution, government authorities have seen the mocking futility of efforts at "regulation" and the most reputable representatives of the medical profession have at last lined up with the most inflexible of moralists in their teaching of the possibility and benefit of self-control. Thoughtful English Catholics have expressed views in harmony with the best of modern developments in the attitude toward this social evil. In 1917, P. S. King published for the Catholic Social Guild a volume entitled *Prostitution: The Moral Bearings of the Problem*, written by a prominent member of the Catholic Social Guild, and containing a chapter on venereal diseases, of which a former resident medical officer of London Lock Hospital, also a member of the Guild, was the author. Among the remedies suggested to lessen the volume of the evil were: dissemination of the knowledge of the physical consequences of promiscuous sexual relations; the careful supervision of the feeble-minded girl who is in danger of being drawn into the maelstrom of commercialised vice; better housing conditions; a living wage, recreational facilities and decent lodgings for working women; and the abandonment of the toleration of a "wild oats" phase in a young man's life.³¹

With reference to the deleterious influence of prostitution on the status of women in general, the author, alluding to the man who has negotiated with the prostitute class, made this comment: "He may come to be in daily contact with average women, later he may come into touch with women as much above the average as the prostitute was below. To him these more highly developed women appear the exceptions, and his subconscious belief in the inherent moral weakness and mental inferiority of woman as a sex remains undisturbed. His mentality thus inclines him towards excessive protection for virtuous women and leaves him cold in face of schemes for their intellectual improvement.

"In the infected outlook of the majority of young men who become predominantly the builders of the social state we have an explanation of the slow and very difficult improvement in

the position of women as a whole. Thus does the small army of prostitutes, serving a large army of young men, avenge itself in the spiritual sphere upon the Society which has not risen to a level which can dispense with its existence. And this vengeance falls primarily upon virtuous women. The man brings his prejudiced judgment to bear on normal life, to the disadvantage of average women.”³²

Various English Catholics have protested against the custom of penalising women who have committed sex offenses while excusing men guilty of the same type of wrongdoing. In this connection, one or two representative opinions may be cited. Monsignor Brown, in an article published in the *Dublin Review*, entitled “The Church and Prostitution,” made this statement: “It may seem a revolutionary thing to say, but as far as one can judge, the whole social attitude towards women who have been immoral must be changed if the evil is to diminish, and not increase. . . . Every sin of fornication is an act of two persons, and it is useless to speak of prostitution as if it were only a matter which concerns women, instead of regarding it as a horrible evil brought about by the unbridled passions of men.” A few years later Father Martindale, in his introduction to Charlotte Leigh-Smith’s pamphlet on *Rescue Work*, declared that “Catholics have once and for all to set their faces against the various versions of the dictum that a man cannot be expected to behave as accurately as a woman.”³³

During the War, frequent inquiries reached the Catholic Social Guild in regard to the part which Catholics should take in the propaganda which was being organised through the country for the sake of combatting the prevalence of venereal diseases. The Guild pointed to the fact that Cardinal Bourne was one of the Vice-Presidents of the N.C.C.V.D., that the Honorary Secretary of the Guild was a member of the Council, and that Father Keating sat on the literary sub-committee, as sufficient guarantee that in its general aims the programme of the National Council was in harmony with Catholic ideals.³⁴

Less immediately connected with the problems of war, but

synchronous with them, were other social questions and social needs with which Catholics in England also concerned themselves. It would be inexact to say that enthusiasm was always present, or that leaders of the social movement did not feel constrained at times to utter protest against recurrent lethargy. Father Plater, for instance, in making an appeal for funds at the Catholic Social Guild meeting at Birmingham in 1915, deplored the ease with which money could be collected for almost any cause, except that of propagating sound social principles. People would subscribe for "the maintenance of superannuated cats and asthmatic poodles," he declared, "but not for the maintenance of the Christian social order."³⁵

There are indications, however, that Catholic interest in social questions never really lapsed. The *Dublin Review* in 1915 published an article on the famous non-Catholic university settlement, Toynbee Hall. Incidentally, the account made mention of the late Mr. Costelloe's enthusiasm for the scheme for the establishment of a Catholic settlement—"Newman House"—in South London, and credited him with having encouraged the growing interest of Catholics in the study of social problems, by the support which he lent to the so-called Guild for Social Reform, in which Catholics participated, and which may be regarded as a precursor of the Catholic Social Guild. Appeals were made by Catholics for reasonable State activity in the solution of the social question. The Rev. Herbert Lucas developed the idea in an article in the *Tablet* in 1917, that the function of the State was neither to let things be, nor to attend to everything, but rather to try as far as possible to get things done. One year later Bernard Vaughan, in an address at Glasgow, rejoiced in the extension of the franchise, by the Reform Act of 1918, to include a great number of the working population who had hitherto possessed no voting rights.³⁶

At the end of the War the Catholic Social Guild published a pamphlet by Father Cuthbert entitled *Labour Claims and Industrial Peace*, in which he pointed out that a merely political peace was not sufficient, if the world were to become happier and

better. It needed the boon of an industrial peace as well. He showed the harmony which existed between Catholic principles and the fundamental claims of the world of labour, namely, the right to a living wage, security against unemployment, more democratic management of industry, and greater freedom for workers in the ordering of their own lives.³⁷

The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster adverted from time to time to social questions. A statement made in *Le Correspondant* that all his writings on the labour movement were worthy of the great tradition of Manning, whose spirit he had perpetuated and whose style he had made his own, may be somewhat exaggerated; but not so the sentence which followed it, to the effect that nothing which concerned England and its people left him indifferent. He was especially insistent upon the workers' right to a living wage, the payment of which, he declared, was industry's first charge. This wage, in his opinion, must be regulated not only by the economic value of the services rendered by a man to his employer, but should also bear some relation to the worker's value to the community as the father of a family.³⁸

The work of the Catholic Social Guild was receiving such widespread notice that in the fall of 1919 it could issue a leaflet containing expressions of commendation which had recently been received from prominent ecclesiastics and laymen. Among those who contributed to this meed of praise were Cardinals Gibbons, Gasquet and Mercier, Dr. John A. Ryan, Prof. Alfred Rahilly and Mr. Hilaire Belloc. Cardinal Gibbons pointed out the need for more trained men and women in social sciences, and wrote that the Guild was fulfilling a glorious mission in equipping future leaders with a knowledge of Christian principles. Mr. Belloc declared that the difficulty was not that the Catholic solution of social problems was disliked or opposed, but that it was unknown. Without assuming that the majority of people would accept Catholic social principles if they were widely disseminated, it was nevertheless imperative, he thought, that they be known, for their inherent possibility of regenerating society. The Guild, he went

on to say, deserved support in the task it had assumed of spreading the Catholic point of view.³⁹

Mr. Henry Somerville wrote a scholarly exposition of the work of the Social Guild during the period of Reconstruction in England. He first gave consideration to the problems of social unrest in England following the War, such as over-taxation, unemployment, the high cost of living, and housing, and then to the part played by the Guild in meeting these problems. He dwelt on the necessity for ethical principles in industrial relationships, and made the point that the Catholic Church had the advantage of possessing the confidence of members of the working class. The Guild, through its study circles, literature and lectures, was, in his opinion, responsive to one of the most vital needs of the hour.⁴⁰

In 1920 the Catholic Social Guild held its first summer school. Men and women, mostly of the working class, and nearly all of them members of study clubs, assembled at Oxford for ten days of serious discussions of social questions. The lectures were well-organised and comprehensive. Father Joseph Rickaby approached these questions from the standpoint of a moral theologian giving their ethical basis; Mr. Francis Urquhart described their historical background; and Mr. Henry Somerville threw light on specific problems of the day.⁴¹ This first meeting proved so successful that a summer school has become an annual feature of the Catholic Social Guild. In 1922 it was noted that the majority of the visitors were young trade unionists from Lancashire, Tyneside and South Wales, with a generous admixture of university students, professional people and men and women of leisure. The Guild has invited distinguished foreigners to address its members at summer school. For instance, in 1924 Mr. Ser-rarens lectured on Continental Trade Unions, and in 1925, when the conferences were devoted to the subject of International Relations and World Peace, the foreign representation was appropriately large.⁴²

A contributor to *Blackfriars* in 1925 wrote a trenchant article entitled "Big Business and Blasphemy." He said that it had been

reserved for our age to produce a heresy which eclipsed all others, the worship of Big Business. Denouncing the cant about its ideals—efficient salesmanship, truth in advertising, and the rest—he pointed out the fundamental difference between the philosophy of Big Business and that of Christianity. Recent literary efforts, like Bruce Barton's *Man That Nobody Knows*, to prove that Christ was the founder of modern business seemed to him the very culmination of blasphemy. "This is indeed," he concluded, "the last horror of a mad world,—that men should be urged to sell their souls for money in order that they may give them to God; to worship money so that they may the better worship the Son of Man."⁴³

At the time of the mining crisis of 1921 the Catholic Social Guild issued a statement through its executive committee in which it recounted the causes of the dispute and considered the practicability of the proposals offered by the contesting parties for its settlement. This manifesto produced some disquietude in the camp of English social reformers, who felt that it represented a dangerous tendency on the part of the Guild to depart from its accustomed practice of not making specific pronouncements on definite industrial issues.⁴⁴

During the present decade, the workers of England lost two of their clerical friends. The fiery Jesuit, Bernard Vaughan, died in the autumn of 1922, and two years later Canon James Hughes of Liverpool, who had been closely connected with the ecclesiastical labours of Archbishop Whiteside, passed away. References have been made to some of the occasions on which Father Vaughan expressed opinions on social questions. Perhaps the best estimate of this side of his career is to be found in Martindale's biography of him, in which the author says that though opinions might differ as to the value of Father Vaughan's views on social subjects, there could be no doubt about his interest in them. Canon Hughes of Liverpool was first led to study the social question by his observation of the sixteen months coal strike, when he was a young priest at Wigan in 1893-1894. His good will toward the wage-earner found expression on many occasions, especially

when in 1911 he coöperated with some trade union leaders in a settlement of the Liverpool dockers' strike. He was also an active supporter of the temperance cause.⁴⁵

The Catholic Social Guild has given thoughtful attention to schemes for social betterment as they have arisen. For instance, in the Guild offices at Oxford a quantity of literature may be obtained bearing on plans for the endowment of the family, that is, methods of securing a family living wage for married men by supplementing the ordinary wages by allowances made for the support of children. Not only are social students encouraged to acquaint themselves with the various aspects of the scheme, to make a study of its exposition by such writers as Miss Rathbone and to observe its operation in countries like France, but the Catholic press has called the attention of its readers to the subject.⁴⁶

STEERING CLEAR OF SHOALS

In a previous chapter the story of the successful opposition of English Catholics to efforts to dragoon them into a political party was recounted. The question has also arisen whether the Catholic Social Guild has been the best organised expression of English Catholic interest in social questions. Specifically, has its method of enlightenment rather than dictation been the best means of stirring Catholics out of their lethargy regarding social questions? At the outset, it must be explained that there existed enough such apathy to call forth complaints from public-spirited Catholics.

Shortly after the Guild was founded, the *Month* lamented that the general attitude of Catholics toward social tendencies in England was one of timid anxiety, and deplored the inclination to regard all democratic legislation as Socialistic.⁴⁷

A little later, Father Cuthbert, in his *Catholic Ideals in Social Life*, deprecated the remissness of the clergy in this respect and urged them to do their part. "There have been priests and theologians," he wrote, "who taboo political economy as though

it were the peculiar weapon of the evil one in these latter days; especially when the economist belongs to one of the more modern and liberal schools. Knowing nothing, frequently, about the economist save that he takes a view of social problems different from that taken in the pulpit, these theologians are ready to denounce and ban, but slow to inquire and learn. . . . In truth there is enough work in our present world both for the political economist and the priest. . . . In the presence of these new social conditions the priest has undoubtedly a serious task. . . . It is not his duty to create economic systems; his part in the work of social reform is to set men thinking of their spiritual and moral duties towards each other.”⁴⁸

The distinguished Dominican, Father Bede Jarrett, writing in *Blackfriars* only a few years ago charged Catholics in general with failing in their apostolic mission:

“The business of the Church in the world is two-fold: to teach and to aid . . . while we frequent the Sacraments dutifully and regularly, we do not attend with equal dutifulness and regularity to another work no less really demanded of us—setting before the world the ideals of Catholic life. . . . We are forever telling the world that we have the real principles through which alone its salvation is to come. We speak of the encyclicals of Leo XIII, and the position of the workingman, which those encyclicals determine. We say that the Catholic Church has the social remedies with the store-cupboard of her moral teaching. But at the moment of a strike or lockout, where do Catholics appear? I mean not the prelates, but the laity, who sit among employers and employed, on Boards of Guardians, on town or city councils. Do they behave any differently from their fellows? . . . What is the use of our talking about the Catholic Church as containing in her teaching the cure of the world’s ills, if in the moment of need individual Catholics do nothing to enlighten, modify or inspire the schemes of their group or party? Either we have principles that are unique, or not. If we have, then our lives and policies should be unique; if we have not, then what is the use or where is the honesty of all our talk?”⁴⁹

Discontent has grown more specific and dissatisfaction has been voiced from time to time because religious authorities have dealt in generalities and have made little effort, and have achieved less success in bringing their principles to bear on questions of actuality. Among those to raise an objection of this sort was Mr. Henry Somerville, who, writing in the *Commonweal* for October 21, 1925, complained that as a matter of fact the social teachings of the Church had little influence on the lives of Catholics. "Our opinions are formed for us by our environment, and our interests," radical Catholic workers accepting the extreme doctrines of *their* milieu, and "Catholic business and professional men" luxuriating in "the same capitalistic mentality as non-Catholic men of the same social strata." The writer went on to blame the Church's failure to commit Catholics to definite economic opinions and pieces of legislation for this chaotic state of affairs, and turned with expressions of relief and approval to the political activities of Social Catholics on the Continent of Europe.

In the December 23, 1925, number of the same periodical, again anent the Catholic attitude toward economic abuses, he wrote: "I have come to the conclusion that we Catholics will have no positive influence on the course of social reform if we confine ourselves to the enunciation of general principles. We must offer the people something concrete and detailed if we are to get them to listen to us. Better risk making mistakes and arousing keen controversy than stagnate in an easy chair of platitudes."⁵⁰ The spread of this view would lead to the drawing up of a Catholic programme by competent authority, and one having religious sanctions—for it would have to be binding in conscience if it were to be effective. Out of such a course a Catholic political party might logically develop.

That there should be differences of opinion amongst Catholics on matters falling not strictly within the realm of revealed dogma, might be hailed rather as a sign of health than otherwise. Such, in any case, is the actual condition regarding a great number of questions. Leaving aside strictly political affairs, what light has been shed on the actual condition with regard to social and eco-

conomic questions? Mr. Bertrand Devas, in 1911, after issuing a warning as to the very limited number of social evils to which specifically Catholic principles could be applied, went on to say:

"One proof of this is the indisputable fact that there is as much diversity of opinion within the Catholic body dividing the extreme progressives from the extreme conservatives as there is outside. If Catholics do not as a rule avow themselves Socialists, it is only because Socialism is under the ban of the Church; but it would be idle to deny that there are many devout Catholics who are attracted by collectivist ideals and who only refrain from joining Socialist societies on account of their loyalty to the Church. They represent extreme progressives, and between them and extreme conservatives (who need no description), every possible phase of thought is represented. Catholics are not united by Catholic principles of social reform, however much they may be united by professing and believing the Catholic faith."⁵¹

Mr. Somerville himself had once acknowledged these conditions and seen reason for them in the circumstances of English life. He wrote in the *Month* for December, 1913: "No doubt if the people around us were all professed Materialists or Malthusians or Anarchists or Communists, Catholics would be at issue with their contemporaries on so many points that their social policy might rightly be considered distinctive. But taking our English world as we find it, composed as it is of moderate Tories and moderate Liberals and moderate Labourites, is Catholic principle and policy clearly marked off from those of these other groups? Or is it not true that there is no distinctively Catholic policy, but that Catholicism is compatible with the general aim of any of these other schools; though occasionally on questions of Eugenics, Education and similar matters, Catholic principles will emphatically veto certain proposals that may commend themselves to other people."⁵²

In so far as diversity of opinion and deficiency in social influence concern really vital issues with an ethical aspect, and arise from uncritical and un-Christian attitudes or callous indifference in the face of inexcusable evils, they are to be deplored.

But does the remedy lie in looking to the Church for definite expressions of opinion regarding economic and industrial questions?

Many objections have been raised to this procedure. As might be expected, it is the Catholic with the liberal type of mind who is most anxious for the Church to speak authoritatively on social questions and declare with unequivocal precision wherein lies the justice or injustice of industrial disputes. Such a person, with a sensitive spirit impatient of the apparent apathy of religion in the face of social ills and with his own soul seared by the spectacle of needless suffering, is likely to call upon his spiritual leaders to speak in each crisis—always with the naïve assumption that their summing up will be that which he desires.

A knowledge of certain facts of history and contemporary life might make him rather pause and pray for a blessed silence, lest the expressed judgment be not always on his side. The French bishops, themselves not too deeply concerned with the welfare of the young men of France, did not hesitate to denounce Marc Sangnier to Rome because his otherwise admirable *Sillon* possessed some dangers and defects. Cardinal Taschereau, of Quebec, struck at the Knights of Labour in the name of God. But fortunately, Gibbons and Manning, with very little high ecclesiastical sympathy on their side, made a winning fight at Rome. The extension of the papal ban to the society in the United States was averted, and the original condemnation was reversed. Many of the old residents of New York City have personal recollections of the unedifying struggle which went on for years between Archbishop Corrigan and Dr. McGlynn. This began when the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions of Tammany Hall, who had "grown gray in the Church" wrote a letter to the vicar-general of the diocese, in which, out of the simplicity of his heart and the disinterestedness of his motives, he inquired if it were true (as rumoured) that the Catholic clergy were supporting Mr. Henry George and his social and political platform. The reply, tending as it did to create the impression that the Church was opposed to Mr. George and his teachings, became excellent campaign material for his political opponent. In 1922, suspicion was not lacking

that the temporary suspension of the National Catholic Welfare Council was inspired by the conservative element, clerical and lay, in the United States of America.⁵³ Instances could be multiplied. But the conservative nature of these interferences should give pause to those who yearn for the intervention of the Church in such matters. The weapon which they invoke may be a two-edged sword.

Not only are the precedents for such direct action unencouraging, but certain psychological factors are against the experiment. Viscount Bryce, in his classic, *The American Commonwealth*, devoted a chapter to what he believed was a recurring phenomenon in American political practice, namely, the failure of the people to select their great men as presidents. The Catholic Church has not always made its most progressive spirits bishops. Shane Leslie, in the *Dublin Review* for October, 1919, while extolling an exception in the person of Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, set down the rule: "It is perhaps accidental that such men as McQuaid become bishops. Rome slakes originality and tempers strength, only allowing a license to either in fields otherwise impenetrable to her system. Bishops normally are obedient fly-wheels, not generating motors; machines of gentle but inflexible calibre, but not unruly machinists."⁵⁴

Responsible positions and great offices are by their very nature likely to have a sobering effect on their incumbents, producing a subtle weakening of the pioneer spirit. Briand, in power, did not handle a threatened railway strike in a manner befitting a professed Socialist; and a liberal Catholic, raised to the purple, will think twice before giving countenance to any movement which threatens to shake, even slightly, the stability of the established order: the conservation of the things that he has become his especial task, together with the safeguarding of those whom Saint Augustine called the fledglings in the nest. One must look elsewhere for aid to innovation. And as far as their reaction to economic conditions is concerned, many churchmen, like many statesmen, live and die sublimely unconscious of the fact that the present relationship between employer and employed is no more

deeply rooted in the essence of things than that which obtained in times past between master and slave, or lord and serf. Others are so complacent in the face of abuses and so frightened at the possibility of change that they might well have posed for Lord Morley's famous word-portrait of the temperamental conservative.

There is a further obstacle in the way of the intervention of ecclesiastics in social and economic concerns. The complexity of some of the problems clamouring for solution is sufficient to baffle economic experts. How, then, can churchmen whose talents are of a very different order, and whose training has been along very different lines, hope to deal with them? Specialists may be paralysed with uncertainty in the face of the intricate problems and widely-ramifying aspects of a coal strike. Is it fair—or wise—to ask members of the hierarchy to pass upon the merits of such a case? to determine, for example, the justice of salary demands in pounds, shilling and pence? or to set the limit of a working day as to the precise number of hours? The action of the good men in such eventualities might not only show them to be uninformed, but make them ever so slightly ridiculous, as happens when they become too specific as to what constitutes modesty in dress.

The English Catholics have not failed to recognise the very intricate nature of social questions. Back in the "nineties," Cardinal Vaughan, in an address delivered at Portsmouth, called attention to the complexity of the social problem and declared that more than one key was necessary to unlock it in all its parts. He did not imply that they were to be found on St. Peter's bunch. Monsignor Parkinson at a later date, when pleading for an enlightened social effort and coöperation on the part of Catholics, wrote, "Social life and economic life in these days are so infinitely complex that dangers and illusions beset the path at almost every step." And after reiterating his statement that social and political problems are most difficult and complicated, he warned his readers that "the smart and easy solutions of the platform orator or the leaflet are often but the crudest superficialities."⁵⁵

There is yet another practical danger inherent in ecclesiastical authorities taking a stand with reference to particular problems and events. It is a serious matter to make any Catholic's loyalty to the Church contingent on the decision of his religious superiors regarding some local occurrence or specific social question which, when viewed in the proper perspective, may be proved to have been of trivial or ephemeral import. There is a type of Catholic who, like William George Ward, would welcome a papal bull each morning with his copy of the *Times*. But there are others—and their name is legion—who are glad that the Pope is not “going around being infallible” as the old lady put it, and that in numerous crises in everyday life they are expected to solve problems as they arise, without recourse to religious authority. Such as these would find repeated intervention on the part of the episcopacy and the clergy in social and economic affairs an unwarranted interference with their personal liberty and perhaps a temptation to the loss of faith.

Granted that it is inadvisable for Catholics to expect churchmen to pass judgment on specific social problems, are they not justified, perhaps, in looking for guidance to an organisation formed precisely for the purpose of studying such questions? Would not the most effective means of rousing Catholics from their social apathy be the drawing up of carefully formulated “programmes” of social reform?

Such questions possess a more than academic interest for the Catholic Social Guild, which has had to face criticism on numerous, and often contradictory, grounds. One group of objectors gave vent to disappointment because the Guild failed to take a decisive stand on various questions, and was content to spread a knowledge of general principles, leaving their specific application to the awakened conscience of the individual Catholic. Such people were casting about for a Catholic Social Programme and were disconcerted because the Guild did not furnish them with a convenient “vade mecum” to be consulted whenever they were confronted with some social problem.⁵⁶

At this point such questions may be raised as: Did not the

Bishop of Northampton set forth a definite programme of social reform at a meeting of the Guild in 1912? Did not the same organisation publish for English readers a *Catholic Social Platform* written by the American Jesuit, Joseph Husslein? And has not the Guild shown at times a willingness to commit itself definitely, as in its statement on the coal strike of 1921? To dispose of the last matter first, the action regarding the strike did not represent the organisation's opinion as a whole, or pledge its members to any specific course.

As regards the address of Bishop Keating, certain facts stand out. He laid down six points of social reform on Catholic lines—the living wage, housing, mutual help, Poor Law reform, child hygiene and fuller education. They were general suggestions about which there could scarcely be much disagreement amongst Catholics—the Catholic social conscience had undoubtedly developed to the point where it accepted trade unions and saw the advantages of school clinics and trade schools—and no effort was made to dogmatise over specific proposals, such as the rival schemes for Poor Law reform. What was more, the Social Guild *Bulletin* explained to its readers that in issuing its programme the Guild had no intention of pledging itself and its members to any one solution of the demonstrated evils. Rather did it aim at focussing the attention of Catholics on their existence, and cultivating a corporate sense of responsibility for their redress.⁵⁷

Similarly, *A Catholic Social Platform*, drawn up by the Rev. Joseph Husslein, of the Fordham University School of Sociology, and reprinted for the Catholic Social Guild, was in reality not an effort to meet definite situations, but a statement of broad and constructive principles, most of them axiomatic to the Catholic social reformer. Neither minds nor consciences were likely to chafe at the acceptance of the idea that men were more than money and persons more precious than machinery, nor were either to agonise over the dictum that strikes were permitted for a grave and just cause. With regard to certain minor points, to be sure—government loans to enable men to settle on the land, the setting up of municipal clinics, etc.—differences of opinion might reason-

ably be expected amongst Catholics. But the author gave no indication that these deductions from general principles had any binding force.⁵⁸

The issue of the *Universe* which gave favourable notice to Father Husslein's pamphlet declared that the Guild had "heroically, though perhaps presumptuously, striven to teach people that principles are more than programmes, and education more than machinery—that if people have the right principles, the right policy will follow, that schemes apart from principles are futilities at the best and usually something worse."⁵⁹

This policy, however, met with opposition in some circles. As early as 1912 it was necessary to answer the criticism that the Guild was at fault in confining itself to general principles instead of coming to grips with actual propositions: "Briefly, the Guild exists not to record decisions, but to study and discuss social problems in a Catholic, but unofficial spirit. . . . Its purpose is not to advocate one point of view or to espouse the exclusive interests of one class; not to turn Catholic Tories into Catholic Liberals or to undermine the allegiance of a Catholic trade unionist; but to train its members to test every point of view and the interests of every class by discussion with those united to us by the bond of common Faith."⁶⁰

About a year later Henry Somerville made a lecturing tour during which he found that some of his audiences failed to understand the function of the Guild. They wanted a cut-and-dried policy on all sorts of social subjects—on the nationalisation of railways, the financing of Labour M. P.'s out of trade union funds, etc.—and they were dissatisfied when they did not get it. This early experience of Mr. Somerville may have influenced his own recent leaning toward greater definiteness of social policy.⁶¹

Critics continued to accuse the Guild of being "academic" and not sufficiently practical, and the Guild defended its position in the face of each attack. On one occasion the unwillingness of the English mind to turn back to first principles was blamed for this type of criticism. Knowledge, it was declared, was necessary as a preliminary to social action; and the fact that the Guild's educa-

tional spade-work was yielding good fruit was attested by reports from different parts of the country regarding the civic enthusiasm displayed by members of study clubs. At that time the additional point was made that if the Guild were to commit itself to a definite programme of social reform its identification with some political party would be almost inevitable.⁶²

Simultaneously with this type of criticism there arose a quite different variety. The Guild was accused of being not too vague, but too specific. It was not accused of committing the Catholic body to everything in general and nothing in particular, but of definitely lining it up with the more radical tendencies in current economic thought. To this day the members of the Guild are grateful to the Archbishop of Liverpool for being the first prelate to give the Guild countenance and support at a time when both were badly needed because of the suspicion of radicalism which lurked in the minds of other authorities regarding the nature of the infant venture. It was felt that the Guild was probably "red"; so Monsignor Keating, who was then Bishop of Northampton, decided to supply in his person and office, "a nice shade of purple," as he whimsically put it.⁶³

In 1916 a local periodical accused the Guild of being in favour of the Servile State. The *Quarterly Bulletin*, while admitting that in the modern Capitalist State any social legislation might be so manipulated as to tend toward the further enslavement of the working class, emphatically denied that the Guild had ever committed itself to any species of paternalism.⁶⁴

The most ambitious attack upon the Catholic Social Guild emanating from the conservative camp occurred in 1914, when a lawyer was called in to examine the publications of the Guild for signs of Socialism. The important literature was listed and each work subjected to criticism. Praise was allotted to such volumes as *The Church and Eugenics* and Mercier's *Duties of Conjugal Life*. Dissatisfaction was expressed with Father Keating's treatment of Feminism, as being too favourable toward the movement. But shafts of adverse criticism were directed chiefly against those publications which dealt with economic aspects of the social question.

Mrs. Crawford's *First Notions of Social Service* came in for considerable denunciation; and in general the Guild writers were found to attack individualism in a far more whole-hearted spirit than that in which they attacked Socialism. This privately printed pamphlet assailed the organisation for its alleged tendency to commit the Church to radical teachings.⁶⁵

Once more the leaders of the Guild rushed to its defense and the *Bulletin* described the pamphlet in unflattering terms. The attack, however, led to an interesting development. Father Plater collected the opinions of eminent theologians, both English and Continental, regarding the *kind* of Socialism condemned by the Popes. Their conclusion was that historically Pius and Leo had intended to condemn only the irreligious radical Socialism rampant in their day, "that universal and absolute Socialist communism which seeks to suppress all private property as being wrong or at least anti-social in itself."⁶⁶

It must be admitted that the Catholic Social Guild has not always accepted criticism, whether proceeding from the left or from the right wing of Catholic thought, with that Tolstoyian spirit of non-resistance which radical pacifists regard as the flower of the Christian ideal. The Guild is a society of men and women, not a choir of angels. In the period of storm and stress through which it has passed, it has deviated little from its avowed course. Through the dissemination of literature and the encouragement of concerted study, it is carrying on its appointed task of equipping English Catholics to meet specific social problems with a knowledge of Catholic social principles. It offers no bromides to mind or conscience but stimulates both to activity for human betterment, in order that some day a more Christian social order than that which exists at present may come to prevail.

THE CATHOLIC WORKERS' COLLEGE

As far back as 1909, Charles Plater was thinking of a Labour College for Catholics. "It is not enough," he wrote, "for Catholic working-men to listen in more or less stolid passivity to other

people's lectures. They must train themselves to lecture. Otherwise, how can we possibly expect them to be alert in the defence of Catholic principles? How can we expect them to be even moderately interested in the Catholic position? Their apprehension will at most be notional and not real, until we set their faculties of thought and speech to work. The results may be clumsy and halting at first; but assiduous practice will work wonders and set us dreaming of a Catholic Ruskin Hall."⁶⁷

When the news of Father Plater's death reached his devoted friends and co-workers, they recalled his dream of a Catholic Labour College, and discussed how they could make it a reality. It was fitting that the Catholic Social Guild should take the initiative. In March, 1921, a memorial signed by the President and Secretary was presented to Cardinal Bourne for submission to the Hierarchy at their coming meeting. The primary purpose of the College was stated to be "the education of Catholic working men in Apologetics and Ethics and in the Social Sciences from the standpoint of Catholic principles" in order to fit them to become leaders in Catholic activity and promoters of Catholic interests in public life and in labour organisations. Catholics, it was urged, must keep abreast of non-Catholics in the important matter of Adult Education.⁶⁸

The Bishops sanctioned the project, and approved the selection of the Executive Committee of the Catholic Social Guild as provisional Governing Council of the College. The Guild at its meeting in the summer of 1921 felt free to set on foot the movement for the establishment of a living memorial to Father Plater in the form of a college at Oxford for workingmen and women. Mr. Somerville explained that the Catholic attitude on social questions was so distinctive that it required special and constant treatment. For this reason the training at Ruskin was inadequate for the Catholic worker.⁶⁹

On first consideration, the Executive of the Guild had not thought it possible to start the College before October, 1922. Their fear that a Principal could not be obtained without prolonged negotiations was removed by the prompt action of the

Jesuit Provincial, who released one of the most capable of his men, Father Leo O'Hea, from his duties as Science Master at Stonyhurst College in order to enable him to take charge of the new College. The other apprehension of the Committee had been regarding the selection of students. But about the time that Father O'Hea was appointed Principal, the Preston Branch of the C. S. G. announced that they had awarded a scholarship to a student who could begin work in the fall of 1921. The Executive Committee provided a scholarship for a second man; and before the opening of the College in October, 1921, the Preston branch of the Guild had come to the rescue with another student.⁷⁰

Father O'Hea, speaking at the meeting of the Guild in August, declared that one of the features of the College would be the union of all classes in the Catholic faith. Nothing must be said to the workingman that could not be said to the employer, and when they sought help from the well-to-do they must say nothing to them that they would be unwilling to say to others. The meeting at which the recently appointed head of the new College spoke these words was held in Ruskin College. He said he regarded that fact as a significant omen. The work carried on at Ruskin College had made a deep impression on him and he would look to it for advice and assistance during the early days of the Catholic Workers' College.⁷¹

The three men obtained in the manner described represented the type of student desired by the College. All were workers. One was a textile operative and treasurer of the Preston Trades Council. The other Preston man was a sheet-metal worker, active in his union. The third came from South Wales, and was an engine driver of the Great Western Railway. These men were selected not that they might use their additional training to gratify personal ambition or become bookish social theorists, but that they might return as leaders to their labour and their communities, ready and willing to serve the interests of the Church and the worker. Mr. Leyland, one of these "charter" students, became organising secretary of the Catholic Social Guild.⁷²

Backed by prodigious enthusiasm and microscopic funds, the College was opened in October, 1921. Principal and students took up their abode in lodgings on Iffley Road, prepared to endure hardships quaintly reminiscent of those undergone by the poor scholars of Oxford in the Middle Ages. Despite material handicaps the College got on admirably. A few books were bought, a few more begged, but most were borrowed, chiefly from Bexhill Library. The tutors were honorary, the Rev. H. Keane, S. J., M. A., taking charge of Ethics; Mr. Urquhart, M. A., of History, and Mr. Somerville, M. A., of Economics. The lectures cost practically nothing because the students were courteously admitted to University Lectures, and nominal fees covered the courses in the social sciences that they took at Ruskin College and Barnett House. Thus was the new institution started, favoured by an opportunity to secure exceptional educational advantages at a minimum expenditure. The students at Ruskin College welcomed the newcomers at their social affairs, and cordial relations were immediately established between them and the Catholic undergraduates at Oxford.⁷³

For the second year of its existence the College moved to a house of its own, the pleasant premises which it still occupies. The building is large, with an attractive garden, and includes the offices of the Social Guild, a library and sleeping quarters of the men students of the College. The roof commands a wide view of the surrounding country, including a field in which stands the "signal-elm" (in reality an oak) mentioned by Matthew Arnold in his *Thyrsis*.

The school year, 1923-1924, brought the first women students to the Workers' College. The three women members of the Executive had worked incessantly towards this end. The problems of support and residence were solved when the Catholic Women's League raised the funds for the scholarships and Miss Margaret Fletcher generously threw open her home to receive the two organisers for women workers' unions who came to Oxford as worthy representatives of the Catholic working women of the country.⁷⁴

In 1926 the College completed its fifth year. The seven students, five men and two women, acquitted themselves well with their studies, and their tutors gave excellent reports of their work. Of the tutors, the College was obliged to part with three of them. Father Keane left to become Jesuit Provincial, Mr. Ogilvie to take up his new tasks as Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh, and Miss Rhodes started on a tour of investigation in America. The fifth year brought the Catholic Workers' College recognition from important educational authorities. The Board of Education recognised the institution as a Residential College under the Adult Education Regulations of 1924, and the Convocation of Oxford University gave its approval to the College "as a Society or Institution in Oxford established for the purpose of higher study," empowered to receive diplomas. It is worth recording that on more than one occasion students at the Catholic Workers' College have obtained the University Diploma in Economics and Political Science. The second year's work is designed to qualify them for this distinction.⁷⁵

Miss Annie McFadden, one of the first women students to be admitted to the Workers' College, gave an enthusiastic appreciation of her experience to a Catholic periodical. Among other things, she wrote: "Two years at Oxford is a happy break in a working man or woman's life, ever to be looked back upon with gratitude. It does not tend to remove them from the sphere of life in which they lived prior to going there, but it does provide mental training and develop powers of concentration which open up a vista of knowledge hitherto closed to them. It enables them to form and conduct study classes and circles of their fellow-workers, to express themselves clearly to others and to speak in public. The knowledge acquired will, while making actual life much more bearable, nevertheless stimulate them to help to remove the causes of the world's distress and implant firmly in their place the Christian principles of charity and justice."⁷⁶

DISTINCTIVE WORK OF ENGLISH CATHOLIC WOMEN

Early in the present century some public-spirited English Catholic women complained of the general indifference of their sisters to the great task of social betterment. Frances Zanetti, writing in 1905, explained how badly Catholic women were needed as visitors to prisons and to the lying-in wards of the workhouse hospitals, as also in the work of rescue and prevention; but declared that they were apparently less interested in activities of this description than were women of other denominations. Nuns, to whom work of this sort was usually left, were as a rule less qualified to cope with it than were women living in the world.⁷⁷

“. . . in the wider sphere of educational and social activity,” wrote Mrs. Crawford, three years later, “in all that is conveniently summed up in the phrase social service, . . . we Catholic women have as yet failed to fill the place that should be ours by right. We have an undeveloped civic sense and a very partial realisation of the responsibilities laid on us by worldly advantages.” She urged all women to study social problems.⁷⁸

It was not long, however, before Catholic women in England became interested in various kinds of social work. Mr. James Britten, when discussing the share which Catholics had taken in settlement work, alluded to the part played by women who, in his opinion, seemed to possess a greater aptitude for organisation and coöperation than was to be found amongst Catholic men. He cited in support of this view the success of the Catholic Women’s League, which had no counterpart in the societies for men.⁷⁹

Perhaps the C. W. L. was both a cause and an effect of the growth of a sense of social responsibility in the ranks of English Catholic women. In any case, it filled a much needed deficiency in Catholic life. The idea of the League began with a paper read by Miss Fletcher at a meeting of the Catholic Ladies’ Conference in July, 1906. Her subject was the “Frauenbund” and other organisations of Catholic women on the Continent. The paper was published in the *Crucible* and circulated as a pamphlet.

Numbers of women accepted the invitation to interest themselves in the formation of a League of English Catholic women. So gratifying, in fact, was the response that the project was launched early in the year 1907.⁸⁰

The League, which is widespread, is non-political in its aims and "social" in the Continental sense, the sense in which the Catholic Social Guild employs the term. Its purpose is to secure unified action among Catholic lay women for the furthering of religious and intellectual interests and the promotion of social work. The members are eager to encourage all movements in politics or industry which seem to them to be for the general good and to refuse countenance to all legislation and activity which threaten to undermine the Christian social order. The organisation has set up social study circles in its various branches, and one of its earliest accomplishments in the field of social education was the founding of three scholarships at the London School of Economics. The Information Bureau does a thriving business; and numerous lectures on social history and economic subjects are given yearly under C. W. L. auspices. The League publishes a periodical of high literary merit called *The Catholic Woman's Outlook*.⁸¹

More specialised in aim than the Catholic Woman's League is the Saint Joan's Social and Political Alliance, formerly known as the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society. Brief mention will be made of its history and work because any group of women organised as are these, for the purpose of bringing about an improvement in the status of women, cannot fail to have an important influence on society as a whole.

The inspiration to found a Catholic Women's Suffrage Society came to two Catholic girls, Miss G. Jeffery and Miss M. Kendall, on December 8, 1910, while they waited in the crowd assembled outside Holloway Gaol to welcome on their release the militant suffragists who had been imprisoned there. The organisation, which was formally inaugurated early in 1911, coöperated actively, though never by violent methods, with other societies founded to work for the political enfranchisement of women.

The Representation of the People Act of 1918 accomplished this in part. But great numbers of English women are still without voting privileges; and the Saint Joan's Social and Political Alliance (which is the organisation's new name, assumed in 1923 to secure greater freedom of action), continues to work for the removal of this discrimination.⁸²

Among the early friends of the Society was the brilliant journalist and exquisite poet, Mrs. Alice Meynell, who found time amidst the pursuit of her literary activities and the care of her large family, to defend such feminist principles as equal pay for men and women, "the frequent necessity of independent calling of the married woman" and "provision for the independent dignity of the wife." When in 1915 the Society began to issue its monthly periodical, the *Catholic Citizen*, Mrs. Meynell contributed the first article. During her lifetime she secured for the cause of woman suffrage the valued friendship of the London *Tablet*.⁸³

In 1918 a lively discussion took place in the Catholic press of England, having as its subject the article on "Woman" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, which had been written by an Austrian priest with an anti-feminist cast of mind. The Catholic Women's Suffrage Society opened the discussion by attacking his contribution as a discreditable anachronism likely to do grave injury to the Catholic cause by putting its official attitude toward women in a false light. There would be no point in quoting from the great number of letters, reflective of varied viewpoints, that were printed in the columns of the *Tablet* and *Universe*. A priest writing in the March 29th number of the *Catholic Times* expressed fear lest some contributions on the subject make it appear that female inferiority was the definite teaching of Scripture and tradition. Blanche Smyth-Pigott, writing to the same paper one week earlier, had called attention to the important fact "that in spite of all the controversies on this subject at different periods of the Church's history, she has never pronounced any dogma about it, and we may marvel at our male and very human theologians all down the ages who have been so anxious to prove the greater

nobility of their origin and the higher purpose of their creation over the sex which is headed by Our Lady herself.”⁸⁴

However, the law of compensation did not fail to function. The author of the objectionable article was an Austrian. In 1922 the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society gave a banquet in honour of Monsignor Giesswein, Chairman of the Hungarian Peace Society and a member of the Hungarian Parliament. He maintained that the great disasters of history had been due to the fact that women had been shut off from the vote. In their admission to the parliaments of the world he saw the hope of the future. His audience may have reflected on the slow but certain action of the mills of the gods.⁸⁵

In 1918 the Society defined its purpose as follows: “to band together Catholics of both sexes in order to secure the political, social, and economic equality between men and women, and to further the work and usefulness of Catholic women as citizens.” In pursuance of its aims the Saint Joan's Social and Political Alliance coöperates with other feminist organisations in demanding equal pay and equality of opportunities for men and women, widows' pensions, the equal guardianship of children as between father and mother, the more extensive employment of women police, and the right of peeresses in their own right to seats in the House of Lords. It likewise strives for the recognition of an equal moral standard for men and women, for the legitimation of children by the marriage of their parents and the doing away with state regulation of vice in all parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations.⁸⁶

Gladstone belittled the significance of the conversions to Catholicism in England in his day on the ground that they were largely among women. He apparently had no concept of the individual and corporate power of women in the field of social action.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ *Crucible*, June 25, 1910.

² *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, pp. 57-70.

³ Martindale, C., *Charles Dominic Plater* (London, 1922), pp. 272, 273; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, Ch. 4, *passim*, Ch. 2. The Bishop adverted again to the subject of social reform in his Advent Pastoral: "An outstanding feature of the first Catholic Congress recently held at Leeds was the place occupied in the programme by the social question in its various phases. To many it was a revelation, to all a subject of rejoicing, to be brought face to face with so much activity originated and conducted on purely Catholic lines. Called into being here and there by individual zeal and the stress of circumstances, these multiform societies are, as it were, the spontaneous passionate blossoming of Christian love—the fruit of a good tree. But still greater promise for the future, perhaps, is contained in the formation of the Catholic Social Guild with its affiliated study classes. As yet in its infancy, it is to this movement we look for the more abundant harvest that coördination and knowledge yield." *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, pp. 136, 137. A "federation" is a diocesan organisation of Catholics for the general purpose of Catholic defense and Catholic progress.

⁴ *Tablet*, August 6, 1910.

⁵ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, pp. 23, 24. During the Norwich Congress a mass-meeting was arranged by the Women's League, at which papers on women's work and wages were read. *America*, July 20, 1912. At the Newcastle-on-Tyne conference, held the previous year, such varied social topics were discussed as Temperance, Catholics and Poor Law Reform, The Catholic Attitude to State Insurance, Socialism, and The Work of the Saint Vincent de Paul Society. *Ibid.*, Aug. 26, 1911.

⁶ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1914, pp. 25-27.

⁷ *Times*, July 7, 1913.

⁸ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1918, pp. 103, 104; *Tablet*, June 4, 1910.

⁹ *Times*, August 7, 1911; *Ibid.*, August 5, 1912.

¹⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, pp. 86-89; *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 113-117; *Ibid.*, 1915, pp. 52-54.

¹¹ *Tablet*, April 6, 1912; *Times*, Jan. 4, 1913; *Ibid.*, Jan. 3, 1914.

¹² Bampffield, G., *Our Losses* (London, 1887); *Dublin Review*, Vol. 144 (1909), pp. 339-356; *Month*, Vol. 114 (1909), pp. 48-58. *Crucible*, Dec. 29, 1909; James Britten, *A Boys' Club* (Reprinted from *Merry England*, for the Penny Library, London).

¹³ *Tablet*, Sept. 2, 1911; *Ibid.*, Jan. 13, 1912.

¹⁴ Jarrett, B., *S. Antonio and Medieval Economics* (London, 1914).

¹⁵ *Times*, June 27, 1914.

¹⁶ A slender, well-illustrated little volume dealing with such topics as the experiences of chaplains was *Catholics of the British Empire and the War* (London, 1919). It is interesting to know that the proportion of chaplains given by the diocese of Westminster was one in six of the secular clergy. *Times*, April 23, 1918.

¹⁷ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1915, pp. 16, 17.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-58.

²⁰ *Catholic Social Guild Quarterly Bulletin*, April, 1915.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.* During the last year of the War, Father J. B. McLaughlin, O.S.B., wrote a thought-provoking little pamphlet entitled *Conscience and the State* (Preston, 1918). Among other questions, he considered the problem of the passive resister. He made the point clear that if a conscientious objector was really conscientious and had taken all reasonable means to inform himself of the issues at stake and yet believed that his government was waging war unjustly, he was bound in conscience not to aid it.

²³ Committee of the Catholic Social Guild (editors), *How to Help the Belgian Refugees* (Second Edition), *passim*.

A plea for the revival of religion and its application to social problems is to be found in the Bishop of Northampton's *The One Thing Necessary* (London, 1915).

²⁴ *Tablet*, Jan. 6, 1917; *Times*, Mar. 14, 1917.

²⁵ *Catholic Social Guild Bulletin*, August, 1917, p. 132; Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, p. 235; *Tablet*, June 9, 1917. In the fall of 1923 Cardinal Bourne addressed a letter to the Catholic clergy urging them to do all in their power to relieve the distress of unemployed ex-soldiers. *Times*, Nov. 26, 1923; *Tablet*, Dec. 1, 1923.

²⁶ *Catholic Social Guild Leaflet* No. 7, p. 4. (The italics are found in the leaflet.)

²⁷ Cardinal Bourne, *The Nation's Crisis* (London, 1918), p. 1, p. 10, *passim*; *Times*, Feb. 11, 1918.

²⁸ *Catholic Social Guild Leaflets*, No. 10 (2nd impression, Oxford, 1919), pp. 3, 4. (The italics are Father Plater's.)

²⁹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1915, pp. 27-33.

³⁰ *Tablet*, July 31, 1915; *Times*, Feb. 23, 1916; *Ibid.*, Oct. 19, 1917; *Tablet*, Nov. 16, 1918. In the summer of 1919, the Cardinal spoke at a meeting called by the Temperance Council of Christian Churches to "protest against the removal of the restrictions on the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors until a permanent measure of reform has been enacted by Parliament." The Cardinal said that such restrictions were necessary because the liberty of the individual must give way to the all-important claims of public welfare. *Tablet*, June 28, 1919.

³¹ M. F. and J. F., *Prostitution, The Moral Bearings of the Problem*. (London, 1917), *passim*. The medical chapters of this book were warmly recommended by the *Lancet* and the *British Medical Journal*. *Catholic Social Guild Bulletin*, Vol. ii, April, 1917, p. 111.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.

³³ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 170 (1922), pp. 113, 120; Leigh-Smith, C., *Rescue Work* (London), p. 4.

³⁴ *Catholic Social Guild Bulletin*, Vol. ii (1917), pp. 110-111. The Guild, however, did not approve of collective instruction of the young on such topics. *Ibid.*, p. 111. Excellent discussions of the moral aspects of the

problem of venereal diseases are to be found in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. 169 (1921), p. 180; *Ibid.*, Vol. 171 (1922), p. 171 *et seq.*

Cardinal Bourne, in an address which he delivered before the Annual Conference of the National Council of Public Morals in 1919 called attention to the enormous amount of work to be done in order to improve the race physically and morally, but declared that lasting good could come only from the measures which recognised the restraining force of conscience and the deciding influence of the law of God. *Tablet*, May 31, 1919.

³⁵ *Tablet*, October 16, 1915.

³⁶ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 156 (1915), p. 273; *Tablet*, Apr. 21, 1917; *Ibid.*, Apr. 20, 1918.

³⁷ Cuthbert, *Labour Claims and Industrial Peace* (London), *passim*. Fr. Plater likewise expressed the opinion that the ideals of modern labour—a passionate yearning for social justice and personal liberty, resentment of bureaucratic interference with family life, a desire for greater opportunities for education and self-expression, and a firm belief that man is more important than property—had always been the ideals of Catholics. *Catholic Mind*, Vol. 16 (1918), pp. 169-171. The Jesuit periodical the *Month* expressed no fear of the gradual social revolution which seemed inevitable. On the contrary, an article on "A New Social Order" made this statement: "All schemes of settlement which contemplate the continuance of the old social order with its 'governing class,' its bourgeoisie, its proletariat, and only aim at improving the material conditions of the worker, are bound to prove wholly inadequate. They do not satisfy the new sense of personality, and the new passion for liberty that is abroad in the world. . . . We have often said and we now repeat that any economic system that necessitates or even tolerates as inevitable, the exploitation of human beings for profit of the exploiter is essentially rotten, and should be destroyed, in God's interest as well as in man's." (Catholic) *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 26 (1919), p. 164.

³⁸ *Le Correspondant*, Dec. 25, 1917; *Tablet*, Oct. 19, 1918; *Central Blatt*, Vol. 11-12 (1919), p. 284. "Cardinal Manning," Shane Leslie once wrote, "was a radical. Cardinal Vaughan was a conservative. Cardinal Bourne perhaps inheriting the tendency of the civil service is an eclectic in politics, liberal with the Liberals, conservative with the Conservatives. If a labour government came in, he would probably, as his Tory friends fear, accommodate himself to labour views, especially as he wrote the most advanced Pastoral, from the social point of view, during the war. Not allowing himself the luxury of partisanship he accepts the politics of the Government until the Government touches the Church. Then he fights. He fought on the education question and a great and non-political moment in his life was when he walked up the Albert Hall between the Duke of Norfolk and John Redmond. . . . His attitude to the Catholic Women's League caused the complaint that he did not properly distinguish between a duchess and a housemaid. Why should he?" *Nation*, July 20, 1921. Might not the Cardinal's eclecticism partly explain his uncompromising attitude toward the general strike of 1926?

³⁹ *Some Recent Messages to the Catholic Social Guild* (Oxford: September, 1919).

⁴⁰ *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 3-4 (1919-20), pp. 213, 214.

⁴¹ *Tablet*, July 10, 1920. The launching of the Catholic Social Guild summer school did not preclude the consideration of social problems at the Catholic Congress held at Liverpool a month later, although it tended to take the form of a discussion of the work of Catholic organisations. *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 5-6 (1919-20), pp. 95, 96.

⁴² *Tablet*, Aug. 26, 1922; *Ibid.*, July 28, 1923; *Ibid.*, Aug. 11, 1923; *Month*, Vol. 140 (1922), p. 236; *Catholic Times*, Aug. 9, 1924; *Ibid.*, Aug. 16, 1924; *Tablet*, Aug. 9, 1924; *Ibid.*, Aug. 23, 1924; *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 8 (1924), p. 320; *Tablet*, Aug. 15, 1925. Every year the Guild issues a Report of transactions at its Summer School.

⁴³ *Blackfriars*, Vol. 6 (1925), pp. 633-639. Other thought-provoking articles to be found in the same periodical are, James, "The Church and Class War," *Ibid.*, pp. 721, 725; Clayton, "Justice and Poverty," Vol. 7 (1926), pp. 281, 289. This magazine is the organ of the English Dominicans. The gifted provincial, Father Bede Jarrett, has made many excellent statements on the social question, some of which have been mentioned in the text. Speaking at the Liverpool Congress in 1920, he said that Labour was probably viewing with cynical amusements the efforts of "the churches" in its behalf. He went on to say that fifty years ago, before Labour found its strength and power, it might have welcomed such help, but now that it had become a force in the land "many people were engaged in stroking Labour down, in delivering to it, not a message, but a massage." Social revolution, he declared, was nearer than most men dreamed, and the small body of Catholics in England must coöperate with all men of good will in giving effect to the great principle of service. *Tablet*, Aug. 7, 1920.

⁴⁴ *The Mining Dispute. A Statement by the Executive Committee of the Catholic Social Guild* (Oxford, 1921); *To Avoid Industrial War. A Statement by the Catholic Social Guild.* (Oxford, 1921.)

⁴⁵ *New York World*, Nov. 1, 1922; Martindale, C. C., *Bernard Vaughan, S.J.* (London, 1923), p. 52; *Catholic Times and Catholic Opinion*, Sept. 13, 1924.

⁴⁶ *Month*, Vol. 144 (1924), pp. 445, 448; *Commonweal*, Nov. 18, 1925. The Guild has also a mass of literature on the medical and ethical aspects of birth control—a topic which has become a vital issue in post-war England. An interesting by-product of the Catholic Social Movement in Great Britain is the "Catholic Council" of Northern England. Among its numerous activities is the placing of Catholic books in public libraries and the putting of questions to local candidates both for Parliament and local government, in order to ascertain their position on important issues. *Annual Report of Sunderland and District Catholic Council* (1923-1924).

⁴⁷ *Month*, Vol. 115 (1910), pp. 16-26.

⁴⁸ Cuthbert, *Catholic Ideals in Social Life* (London, 1911), pp. 90, 91.

⁴⁹ *Blackfriars*, Vol. 3 (1922), pp. 496, 500, 502, 503.

⁵⁰ *Commonweal*, Oct. 21, 1925.

⁵¹ *Tablet*, Sept. 16, 1911.

⁵² *Month*, Vol. 122 (1913), p. 572.

⁵³ Post, L. F. and Leubuscher, F. C., *An Account of the George-Hewitt*

Campaign in the New York Municipal Election of 1886 (New York, 1886?); Will, *Life of Cardinal Gibbons*, 2 vols. (New York, 1922), Vol. i, pp. 324-354; *New York World*, June 14, 1922; *Ibid.*, June 15, 1922; *Ibid.*, June 19, 1922; *Ibid.*, June 21, 1922; *Catholic News*, June 24, 1922; *Ibid.*, Aug. 19, 1922.

⁵⁴ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 165 (1919), p. 261.

⁵⁵ *The Humanitarian*, Vol. iii (1893), p. 401 *et seq.* *Tablet*, Sept. 14, 1907; Parkinson, *Catholics and the Social Movement* (In *Socialism, Tracts for the Times* (New York, 1912), p. 168. Leo XIII grew rather dangerously specific when he asserted in his Encyclical that private ownership increased production. After all, this was a subject on which only economists could speak with authority.

⁵⁶ Tom Kettle, the Irish writer into whose last days were crowded events of unusually dramatic import, wrote the following words for the *Dublin Review*: "A priest with spare time can help greatly towards peace, not by lecturing his people . . . but by reasoning out with them in quiet conference the significance of the economic conditions among which their lot is cast. . . . But any attempt to formulate in the name of the Church a rigorous and exclusive social programme, and to insist that that alone is sound Catholic policy, must of its nature, be futile and even dangerous. It is indeed part of the mission of the Church to safeguard those ethical truths which lie at the basis of all society; and when it comes to a discussion of the technical processes of society, economic and political, every man must effect his own synthesis of principle and technique, and he must be free to follow the light of his own conscience and his experience." *Dublin Review*, Vol. 151 (1912), p. 393. Professor Kettle's English readers have, on the whole, adopted the same viewpoint.

⁵⁷ *C. S. G. Leaflets*, No. i, *passim*; *C. S. G. Bulletin*, April, 1912.

⁵⁸ Husslein, J., *A Catholic Social Platform* (Oxford, 1920), *passim*.

⁵⁹ *Universe*, January 30, 1920.

⁶⁰ *Catholic Times*, March 22, 1912.

⁶¹ *C. S. G. Bulletin*, January, 1914.

⁶² *Ibid.*, Vol. ii (April, 1916), p. 66.

⁶³ *Tablet*, August 15, 1925.

⁶⁴ *C. S. G. Bulletin*, Vol. ii (April, 1916), p. 66.

⁶⁵ *A Report (made by request) Upon the Catholic Social Guild's Publications: Their Teaching and Their Tendency* (London, 1914); Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 289, 290.

⁶⁶ *C. S. G. Bulletin*, October, 1914. Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, pp. 290-292. The quotation is to be found on p. 291.

⁶⁷ Martindale, C., *op. cit.*, p. 270.

⁶⁸ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1922 (Oxford), Ch. iv. Two ventures in Adult Workers' Education mentioned in the memorial are Ruskin College, Oxford, and the Labour College, London. The students at Ruskin are paid for out of Trade Union funds and pursue their studies in a mildly Socialistic environment. The atmosphere at the Central Labour College in London is more radical.

⁶⁹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1922, p. 40; *Universe*, Aug. 26, 1921.

⁷⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1922, pp. 41, 42; *Tablet*, Aug. 27, 1921.

⁷¹ *Universe*, Aug. 26, 1921.

⁷² O'Hea, L., *The Catholic Workers' College* (Oxford, 1922), *passim*; *Studies*, Vol. 10 (1921), pp. 391-400; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1922, Ch. viii.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, Ch. i, Ch. v. At the time it was definitely decided to start the College, there were about £10 at hand. The chief expenses for the first year had to be paid for by the Guild out of its general funds. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁷⁴ *Catholic Truth and Catholic Book Notes*, Vol. iii (May-June, 1926), pp. 66, 67.

⁷⁵ Catholic Social Guild, *Report of Seventeenth Annual Meeting Held in Ruskin College, Oxford, July 25, 1926*. (Oxford, 1926), pp. 5, 6.

⁷⁶ *Catholic Truth and Book Notes*, Vol. iii. (May-June, 1926), pp. 66, 67.

It is Miss Margaret Fletcher who trains the students in oral expression, the purpose being to rid them of provincialisms and fit them for public speaking. The writer of this book had the pleasure of listening to a recital from standard literature which was given by the students at the College in June, 1926.

⁷⁷ *Tablet*, September 30, 1905.

⁷⁸ Crawford, V. M., *Ideals of Charity* (London, 1908), pp. 2 *et seq.* In an article written for the December, 1909, issue of the *Month*, Mrs. Crawford called the attention of her readers to the Women's Industrial Council, an association to promote the industrial betterment of women workers.

⁷⁹ *Dublin Review*, Vol. 156 (1915), pp. 285, 286. An account of two Catholic Women's Settlements is to be found in Picht, W., *Toynbee Hall and the English Settlements* (London, 1914), pp. 230, 231.

⁸⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, pp. 73, 74.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 74-82; *Tablet*, May 30, 1908. *Catholic Charities Review*, Vols. 3-4 (1919-20), pp. 220, 221; *Month*, Vol. 113 (1909), p. 484 *et seq.*; *Tablet*, May 1, 1909; *Ibid.*, Oct. 15, 1910; *Ibid.*, Aug. 19, 1911; *Ibid.*, May 19, 1917; *National Catholic Welfare Council Bulletin*, Vol. iv (1923), pp. 31, 32.

Regarding the matter of the higher education of Catholic women, the *Tablet* wrote: "The women of the country are now actively coöperating in every department of the national life. There is a call for women doctors, dentists, lawyers, and, above all, teachers and university lecturers. It is imperative that Catholic women should take their due place in this general march of progress," *Tablet*, Aug. 12, 1922.

⁸² *Catholic Times*, Sept. 3, 1926.

⁸³ *Ibid.*; *Commonweal*, July 8, 1925. An American woman has written a biography of Alice Meynell: Tuell, A. K., *Mrs. Meynell and Her Literary Generation* (New York, 1925).

⁸⁴ The first attack upon the Encyclopedia article was written two years before and constituted the leading article of the *Catholic Suffragist* for July 15, 1916. The author was Leonora de Alberti.

⁸⁵ *Catholic News*, Sept. 9, 1922.

⁸⁶ *Catholic Times*, Sept. 3, 1926.

The St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance opposes special protective

legislation for women in industry on the ground that it treats them permanently as minors and lowers their status as workers. We read in the handbill announcing the annual meeting for March 19, 1927, that the Alliance "believes that the only policy which safeguards their individual liberty and responsibility is that of basing all labour regulations and restrictions upon the nature of the work and not upon the sex of the worker and calls upon the Government to apply this principle to the promised new Factories Bill."

CHAPTER VI

FOREIGN CONTACTS AND WORLD PEACE

It was to be expected that Catholic social action in other countries should influence Catholic social action in Great Britain and be in turn affected by it. Men and women of all nations and of varied creeds interested in human welfare have a way of extending a hand of fellowship across frontiers and of coöperating in good works regardless of differences of faith, and so they come to speak the common language of a common cause. But understanding is greatly facilitated when such social reformers though differing in the object of their civil allegiance are bound by the close tie of a single spiritual loyalty which of its nature transcends the limits set by nationality and race.

There is a strong temptation to be intrigued into the fascinating byways suggested by these facts. Adequate treatment of the theme, however, would presuppose an exhaustive knowledge of the Social Catholic Movement in all its various manifestations in every country of Christendom; and the accounts of these several developments have only begun to be written. In addition, a knowledge of the proceedings of all international Catholic Congresses would be necessary for any one essaying this task. To the possession of such comprehensive equipment the present writer makes no pretensions. When an exposition of every phase of Catholic social action along national lines has been written and likewise the story of international Catholic conferences convened for social purposes, then and then only will there be satisfactory material for the weaving of the threads of relationship into a tapestry giving in true perspective a picture of social Catholicism throughout the world. There is need for such a work and it is to be hoped that it may yet be undertaken when

each of the constituent syntheses has been made and the Social Catholic Movement itself has begun to display some integrity of international organisation. Meanwhile a few casual contacts and indications of indebtedness of country to country may be noted to show that Catholic social action in England is not by any means an isolated growth.

Because of the greater number of Catholics both absolutely and relatively in Continental Europe, Catholic social action there got the start of similar work in England, and in some countries continues to lead it to so great an extent that the London *Tablet* was able to write as the year 1925 was drawing to a close, "Catholic social action in Britain is a small weak thing compared with the mighty Catholic social movement on the Continent of Europe."¹ Yet so powerful have been the personalities of some of the English leaders in this field, and so admirable in motivating intelligence and zeal have been the organised activities of this "small weak thing" that it has from the beginning been able to raise a lusty voice sufficiently insistent to influence, if scarcely to confound, the strong. It has even spoken in the tones of a prophet holding forth not without honour save in his own country and in his own house. The *Dublin Review* in discussing Professor Moon's well-documented work on social Catholicism in France declared that "De Mun would have had no career in England. Manning's apostolate was largely carried out abroad. His letter, for instance, sounded the keynote of the Congress of Liège which was swept to the extreme left of Christian Socialism."² Somewhat exaggerated as this statement is as regards England itself, scarcely any exception can be taken to the implication that there have passed beyond the shores of Britain, emanating from the confines of that "tight little island," definite waves of Catholic social influence. The indebtedness of Great Britain to other countries is even more obvious. It is fitting that we give some attention to this movement of action and reaction which came in time to take the form of coöperation in social efforts of international scope and led to an apostolate in behalf of world peace.

THE PRESTIGE OF THE PIONEERS

That redoubtable old warrior in behalf of social progress, Cardinal Manning, as has been pointed out, envisaged world betterment and, devoted as he was to his compatriots, he did not confine his interests to the well-being of Britons alone. He favoured international action to forward democracy and improve the condition of the working classes. It was for that reason that he gave his enthusiastic approval to the Conference of Berlin in 1890 and later in the same year sent his famous letter to the president of the Congress of Liège in which he denied that it was possible to establish efficacious and permanent peaceful relations between employers and workingmen unless a just and fitting standard should be publicly fixed and established, regulating profits and wages, a standard which should govern all free contracts between Capital and Labour, the contracts themselves being subject to periodic revision to conform to the inevitable variations of trade. This stand led G. de Molinari in *Le Journal des Économistes* to comment: "M. Liebknecht lui-même ne va pas plus loin."³

A few days before the Congress, Manning had said that the labour question would go on until it was solved somehow and that the only universal influence that could guide it was the presence and prudence of the Catholic Church. His opinion greatly influenced the course of the Congress of Liège although a month later at Angers, Monsignor Freppel attacked it as radical.⁴

Manning adopted with sincerity the idea of the "white man's burden." He believed his country had definite imperial obligations to which the public conscience should be aroused; and his untiring efforts to urge the suppression of the African slave raids were a tangible expression of his ideals. Vaughan gave strenuous support to the same movement, convinced as he was of the civilising mission of Britain in the valley of the Nile. He likewise exerted some influence on the Congress of Liège.⁵

Considerable notice was taken abroad of the ideas on social questions expressed by Bishop Bagshawe of Nottingham, whose

isolated rôle in the history of social Catholicism in England will be considered in a section appended to this work. Foreigners paid to his contributions to social theory an enthusiastic and often exaggerated homage. Signor Nitti, the Italian sociologist, asserted that Bagshawe was more radical than Manning and a thoroughgoing State Socialist.⁶

Teutonic and French sympathisers in their turn extolled the message on the social question which this English prelate expressed in his pastorals. "Aus England haben wir eine höchst erfreuliche kirchliche That zu berichten. Der katholische Erzbischof von Nottingham in England hat in seinem letzten Hirtenbriefe die kapitalische Gesellschaftsordnung vom kirchlichen Standpunkte aus einer kritischen Untersuchung unterzogen," wrote Vogelsang, and went on to say that his readers would be grateful for some extracts from the "hochwichtigen Darlegungen dieses ebenst gelehrten als scharfsinnigen Kirchenfürsten."⁷

The French contributed their meed of praise. Articles in *L'Association catholique* placed before French readers Bagshawe's enlightened view on the rights of Labour and the duties of the State. M. Benedict, writing on social Catholicism in *La Revue Socialiste*, adduced "les remarquables mandements de l'évêque Bagshawe" in support of his thesis that German and English social Catholics, unlike the French who interdicted the term "social Christian," went "jusqu-au socialisme." Monsignor Doutreloux in his address at the Liège Congress in 1886 on the duties of employers towards their workmen, after asserting that the state had the right and duty to intervene in order to make justice prevail, said that he subscribed to the declaration of his Lordship of Nottingham that the State should intervene whenever without public or legal action the necessary relief could not be obtained or injustice redressed.⁸

PLATER'S INDEBTEDNESS TO CONTINENTAL PRECEDENTS

Father Charles Dominic Plater, to whose social zeal the Catholic Social Guild owed so much in its inception and progress, was

deeply indebted to Continental examples. The superb Catholic organisation of Holland was displayed to his admiring eyes by Father Raijmaeckers at Maestricht; and it was at Xhonnement that he saw for the first time a house set apart exclusively for retreats. While observing social work in France he met M. Marc Sangnier. His biographer regards the visit to France in 1904 as a turning point in Plater's career, or at least clinching the effect made upon him by his visits to Canterbury, to Holland and Belgium. These journeys inspired the series of articles on "Our Social Forces" which appeared in the *Universe*. Continental influence is also discernible in his idea of a "Catholic Platform," a basis from which Catholics could unitedly start to offer their special contribution to the world's notice. He thought of writing a life of Ketteler and contributed articles to the French *Guide social*. In May, 1908, the Director of the Volksverein asked him for a section on English Catholic Congresses for an article to appear in the Catholic Encyclopedia. In consequence of the efforts of Father Plater, the literature of the Action Populaire was introduced to the English public at the first National Catholic Congress at Leeds in July, 1909. Meeting Père Pupey-Girard at Brussels he went with him to the first Conseil International des Ligues Catholiques Féminines.⁹

Plater complained that certain clever men he met in Glasgow were doctrinaire and "narrow in their lines—knowing nothing of social action abroad, little of history, and given to the *idée fixée*." Social action abroad loomed very large in his imagination and he had the satisfaction of seeing the Guild represented at the international conference which was convened at Antwerp by the "Ligues Sociales d'Acheteurs." He made use of a twopenny pamphlet, *A Catholic Social Platform* written by an American priest, Father Joseph Husslein, as a kind of textbook for the first summer school of the Guild. The last constructive work of his life was the foundation of the Unione Leonina, a Maltese adaptation of the Catholic Social Guild. He had been attracted to this English-owned island of foreign population—the ancient isle of Melita on which St. Paul was shipwrecked—by the com-

munication which he had had with various people there regarding the social and labour problems peculiar to that locality, and it was to the Association of Old Pupils at the Sacred Heart Convent there that he spoke just before his death, urging his audience to service for God and fellowmen and explaining the part that women would play in the new society.¹⁰

IRELAND

On account of the predominantly Catholic population of Ireland, no less than because of the proximity of one island to the other, it was not surprising that social influences should pass to and fro across the Irish Sea. It was, as we know, the Irish immigration to England and Scotland which, by producing a Catholic industrial class, forced the presence of a social problem upon the consciousness—and the conscience—of English and Scottish Catholics, and the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain left in time its impress on the sister isle. Dissimilarity in local conditions, however, caused this influence to be relatively slight and late in coming. The Catholics of Ireland, unlike those of Great Britain, were primarily agrarian in interests, and with a population preponderantly harmonious in its ethical and religious outlook, Ireland was confronted with little danger of being burdened with local legislation at variance with Catholic principles. Up through the first decade of the twentieth century there was no organisation for the formal study by layfolk of the economic causes of social ills with a view to striking at them at their sources, such work as existed, whether preventive or remedial, being of an immediate and practical kind.¹¹

There was, nevertheless, abundant room for improvement. An interest in social problems would be awakened by concerted study, and coördination of activities was needed to eliminate much unnecessary duplication and waste. The inspiration for the change came from England in the form of a lecture delivered by Charles Plater in Dublin in May, 1912. In the autumn of 1911, a special sub-committee of the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland had been

formed to seek the most effective means of annulling the effects of anti-Christian activity in Ireland. Father Plater's lecture provided the needed suggestion and gave additional impetus to the new Catholic movement. It was decided to form a Study Circle in Dublin along the lines of the English Catholic Social Guild, and, if this should prove successful, to organise a series of study clubs throughout the country. To this project the Catholic Truth Society gave its hearty support. The parent association was named the Leo Guild, so called from the basis on which its work should rest, namely, the study of the great Encyclicals of Leo XIII on social questions, together with the subsequent pronouncements of the Holy See along the same lines. The movement spread and soon two types of organisations sprang up—study circles and the less pretentious popular circles. The Leo Guild owed much to the guidance of Father Lamberth McKenna whose series of pamphlets dealing with the Church and the social problem were published by the Catholic Social Guild of London.¹²

There had been other contacts. For example, Professor Windle of Cork University had participated in the discussion at the Newcastle Congress in the summer of 1912. Two years later Mr. George Milligan read a paper at the Conference of the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland which won a marked tribute from the Archbishop of Tuam.¹³

But as has been disclosed by reference to the work of certain outstanding personalities like Manning, Bagshawe and Plater, it was the connections made between Great Britain and the countries of Continental Europe—especially France and Germany—that were of greatest significance. The distinguished Danish convert and litterateur, Johannes Jørgensen, author of such widely different books as *St. Francis of Assisi* and *False Witness*, in an autobiographical romance which he wrote, had the hero's interest in social works date from his studies of Manning, Ketteler and Leo XIII. Mgr. Giesswein of Hungary took part in the discussion at the Newcastle Congress in the summer of 1911; and Mr. Charles Bathhurst, a non-Catholic member of Parliament, in a

speech before the Church Congress of 1913 at Southampton, dwelt on the leading part taken by the Belgian clergy in the improvement of agriculture.¹⁴

SPAIN AND ITALY

Catholic social action in Spain and Italy was noted in the pages of the *Catholic Social Year Books* of the Guild. The *Année Sociale Internationale* for 1910 speaks of the Social Catholic Movement in Spain as being rather late in getting under way, although by that time it was definitely formulated, with much still to be done. Syndical Catholic workers organised at the end of 1912. In an article by Alvaro de Albornoz "Religion, Liberalismo y Socialismo," appearing in *La Lectura*, the problem selected is treated in its general aspects and an effort made to show that there is no antagonism in these various phases, if they are informed by the proper moderate spirit. A very general reference is made to Manning, Gibbons, etc., as being leading spirits in the movement. One statement of the author is worthy of mention. In his opinion Social Catholicism is not a doctrine but an attitude—"Lo que se llama socialismo catolico no es una doctrina; es una actitud,"—an attitude, namely, of sympathy for the workers, a desire to better their condition, and to improve the relations that exist between all human beings.¹⁵

In a volume of *La Lectura* there appeared an account of congresses of the international woman's movement. No reference was made to its English aspects. Indicative, however, of the growth of Catholic women's activities in England and of Spanish interest in what was for that year English international leadership in this field was the appearance of a delegate from Spain at the International Congress of Catholic Women's Leagues which took place at Westminster, June 25-29, 1913.¹⁶

At a meeting of the Catholic Union held in the spring of 1920, Mr. J. F. Hope read a letter which by unanimous agreement was sent to the Spanish Catholic Association in Madrid, its ultimate object being the appointment of a permanent correspondence

secretary in order to bring the Catholics of Great Britain and Spain into closer relations. Such action was needed; for although the basis for conclusions is rather limited, there is ground for believing that there have been very few contacts between English and Spanish social Catholics, unless indeed such recognition or indebtedness has gone unperceived or unacknowledged. Perhaps some explanation of the phenomenon can be found in the position of social Catholics in Spain. They must be reckoned with as an intellectual force; but they have failed as yet to attain great political power. Señor Maura's capable leadership was of such a nature as to give them so conservative an orientation as to make impracticable the establishment of close ties between them and their more progressive English brethren.¹⁷

There are numerous Catholic social works in Italy and they have served to bring out strong personalities like Toniolo, Murri, Valente and Don Sturzo. The movement is one of "leaders' " parties reflective in its energy of the southern temperament, of rather dispersed organised activity characterised by numerous efforts without much coördination, and difficult to disentangle from political conditions with which perforce it is much bound up. Until recently the international aspect was not emphasised. Professor Giuseppe Toniolo, who founded at Bologna in 1888 the Catholic Union of Social Studies and a little later the *Rivista internazionale de science sociali*, felt that his country was behind Belgium, France and Germany for lack of organised effort. As we have seen, at that time the movement in England was likewise represented only by individual workers like Manning.¹⁸

In Vausard's work on Catholic intelligence in Italy in the twentieth century, we read: "Le grand problème d'une entente internationale qui permette un développement pacifique de civilisation depend, pour une large part, de l'accord profond qui pourra s'établir entre catholiques français et italiens."¹⁹ This seems to summarise the attitude of the Latin "entente" and partially explains the ignoring of countries outside the sacred circle—England, for example.

This does not mean, of course, that individual Italians have been deficient in appreciation of Catholic social action in Great Britain. To cite one instance, Cardinal Capecelatro, Archbishop of Capua, in his book, *Christ, the Church and Man*, paid a glowing tribute to Manning: ". . . I know none among Catholic Socialists (let the name be permitted me) braver than my late beloved friend, Cardinal Manning, a social student fearless in speculation, effectual in enterprise. . . . Manning, living as he did in the midst of the independent and tenacious English people, did not hesitate to put himself at the head of Christian 'Socialism.' . . . Temperance, arbitration, peace-making, public charity, had in him an eloquent, a persistent, a fearless advocate." ²⁰ Francesco Nitti devoted a substantial section of his *Catholic Socialism* to the progress in England of the movement which he was describing. He was eloquent in his praise of the achievements of Manning and Bagshawe.

It is, nevertheless, interesting and significant to note that the greater part of the articles in the *Rivista Internazionale*, productive though it is in material on international phases of the Social Catholic Movement, have reference to the countries of Continental Europe, and England is left in her wonted isolation. In 1924, however, there appeared in this periodical an article on *La Confederazione Cattolica Internazionale*, by G. B. Nicola. It was a report of the Congress held by the International Catholic League at Lugano in August of that year. The enthusiasm shown there by a young English leader, Captain Eppstein, caught the attention of the writer. The ardent and tenacious Eppstein—"dell'ardimentoso e tenace Eppstein"—he called him, and looked to such men as Eppstein, Professor Edberg and Flagollet Strattmann to instil new life into the C. C. I. He thought that a Council analogous to that in England of which Eppstein was secretary was needed in all countries. This development was in line with a growing tendency on the part of Rome to give increased attention and better understanding than formerly to Catholic affairs in English-speaking countries.²¹

FRANCE AND GERMANY

The ideal of concerted social study espoused by the promoters of the Catholic Social Guild admittedly owed much to the example of the German Volksverein and the French Action Populaire, and contacts between English Catholics on the one hand and those of France and Germany on the other have been established at many points. At the Catholic conference held in Manchester in September, 1909, Père Cavois who had been especially delegated by the Action Populaire to attend the meeting read a report of the work of his organisation. This story of that "famous center of religious and social propaganda" was retold in a C. S. G. penny pamphlet, and one of its representatives read a paper on the subject at the Guild meeting in connection with the Leeds Congress. Père Cavois participated likewise in the discussion at the Newcastle Congress in 1911.²²

In 1911, Monsignor Parkinson edited a translation of Leon Garriguet's *Social Value of the Gospel* which was issued by the Catholic Truth Society. Father Plater in his *Priest and Social Action* testified that it was in France that the interest of the clergy in social work had produced the most voluminous literature and was best known to English readers."²³

Similar connections with Germany have been established from time to time. We have seen that the Catholic Women's League of England took its origin from a paper devoted to a consideration of the work of the Frauenbund which was read by Miss Fletcher at a meeting of the Catholic Ladies' Conference in July, 1906.²⁴

The *Catholic Weekly*, later amalgamated with the *Universe*, as far back as July, 1904-March, 1906, published under headings of "The Outlook" a number of papers describing the organisation and progress of Catholic social work in other countries. The series began with Belgium and among the most important was the attention drawn to developments in Germany in the articles contributed by Plater. His ideas were afterwards incorporated in a book entitled *Catholic Social Work in Germany*. The author

drew lessons of value to Englishmen. He praised the idea of annual congresses, and, enumerating their practical advantages in sustaining the enthusiasm for Catholic social work which Bishop von Ketteler had originally infused into the Catholic body in Germany, he expressed the hope that English Catholics would emulate their German coreligionists and convene in a similar manner. The Catholics of England were in need of precisely such social solidarity. The annual conferences organised by the Catholic Truth Society reproduced some of the most striking and valuable features of these German congresses. Father Plater was struck with admiration for the German genius for organisation as expressed in the Augustinusverein, a group of Catholic journalists and authors most helpful in disseminating good literature, and likewise, for a body of Catholic intelligentsia known as the "Görresgesellschaft," organised for the purpose of fostering learning in all its branches.²⁵

In his later work, *The Priest and Social Action*, Plater called the Volksverein which Windthorst had founded in 1890, "the most remarkable organ of social education in the world." Toward the end of his survey of Catholic social work in Germany he linked the names of Bishop von Ketteler and Cardinal Manning: ". . . both taught Catholics not to confine their social activities to Catholic institutions and both came to be regarded as the natural champions of the toilers and sufferers of a whole nation."²⁶

INFLUENCE IN AMERICA

There have been examples of such interaction between England and America. The English Guild was the model for the Catholic Social Service Guild formed in the city of Montreal, and most cordial relations grew up between the two organisations. M. St. Pierre contributed an interesting description of the progress of the Catholic social movement in Canada to the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1913. The editor of the latter regarded the account given by M. St. Pierre as a source of inspiration to his

English coreligionists. In consequence of a visit paid to Montreal by Mr. Ambrose Willis, the Catholic Literature League was formed there with aims not very different from those of the C. R. G. of England. The Catholic Social Service Guild found Monsignor Parkinson's *Primer of Social Science* of much practical benefit to it in its work."²⁷

As to the United States, we have seen how Cardinal Gibbons and Cardinal Manning made common cause in behalf of the right of the workers to organise, and in defense of the principles which underlay the growth of industrial democracy. In 1910 there was formed The National Conference of Catholic Charities; and at its first meeting, in September of that year, reference was made to the English Catholic Social Guild, and American Catholics, both priests and laymen were urged to take up social study as a means of shaking off their apathetic attitude towards social questions. Dr. William J. White, discussing this conference in an article which he wrote for the Jesuit Weekly, *America*, called attention to what the English *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1910 had to say on the social as well as the religious value of retreats for workingmen. Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock, who spoke on the "Developing of the Social Conscience" at the meeting of the following year, quoting Hilaire Belloc's address at the English Catholic Congress a few weeks before, stated that outside the Church the relief proposed for social ills was either the exaggerated paternalism of the Servile State or else Collectivism. He recalled, too, the words of the Bishop of Northampton at the English Congress who had pointed out the essential nature of the bond between Christian faith and Christian charity and the necessity for social regeneration that the two might not be severed.²⁸

About the middle of the nineteenth century there sprang up in the United States a German-American society of Catholics organised for social research and social action. It still exists and is known as the American Central Verein. Its headquarters are at St. Louis and it conducts study courses and encourages the growth of study clubs, maintains a settlement, publishes and disseminates literature on social topics and carries on other useful

activities. For a number of years this organisation was in close communication with the Catholic Social Guild. The Verein imported and advertised copies of its brochures, but the outbreak of the War dispelled hopes of further contact and coöperation. Since then the growing dissimilarity between social conditions in the United States and in England has made impractical any attempt to disseminate literature dealing with purely British conditions. The *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, however, continues to devote articles to the progress of social Catholicism in England. In 1910, Father Plater writing to a friend in St. Louis spoke in terms of praise of the work of this paper: "I find the 'Central-Blatt and Social Justice' *most* instructive and stimulating. It is doing a great work."²⁹

Dr. John A. Ryan, a well-known American Catholic theologian, stated in an article contributed to the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1913 that the Central Verein office had brought out some good pamphlets, but added, "In this field of pamphlet literature we are a long way behind our coreligionists of England. In fact, most of the publications of this kind in use amongst us have come from the Catholic Truth Society of London and the English Catholic Social Guild." He went on to expound the need for local study clubs and said: "Most of us are as yet overwhelmed by a sense of vagueness and helplessness with regard to the whole matter of social questions, social evils, social study, social activity and social reform."³⁰

Father Dietz, Secretary of the Social Service Commission of the American Federation of Catholic Societies, writing for the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1913 called attention to the demands for social action and stressed the importance of study clubs. Mr. Ambrose Willis, a member of the Executive Committee of the Catholic Social Guild, attended the Milwaukee Convention in August 1913 and brought the Guild into very close touch with the Social Service Commission. In giving his impressions of the convention, Mr. Willis drew attention to the radical differences between conditions of social action in America and in England. The problems in the United States were less

acute and the masses less irreligious than in England. In America, too, a large proportion of the workers were Catholics. He attributed to the less vital nature of the social question in America the fact that up to that time Catholics there had been slower than English Catholics to recognise the importance of social study.³¹

Plater, however, thought the work of the National Conference of Catholic Charities was of a type in advance of that being done in England. He considered the recent growth of study clubs a very encouraging feature of Catholic social work in America. Certain books dealing with social subjects produced by American clergy found readers in England. Such were Bishop Stang's *Socialism and Christianity*, which had been warmly praised on its appearance by Charles S. Devas, Father Ming's two books on Socialism, and Father Husslein's *The Church and Social Problems*.³²

When the administrative committee of the National Catholic War Council, now the National Catholic Welfare Conference, of the United States drew up their well-known programme for Social Reconstruction after the War, they adverted to English contributions and English pronouncements on plans for the new social order. They characterised Cardinal Bourne's Lenten Pastoral as "probably the most important declaration from a Catholic source."³³

The same pamphlet contained an analysis of the position on social reconstruction taken by the "Inter-denominational Conference of Social Service Unions" of Great Britain in which Catholics participated. The writers of the American reconstruction programme praised the stand taken by that body because it was definite and therefore "not liable to the fatal objection that is frequently and fairly urged against the reform pronouncements of religious bodies; that they are abstract, platitudinous and usually harmless." The value for Catholics of the explanations and modifications appearing in the Year Book of the Catholic Social Guild for 1918 was likewise pointed out.³⁴

Early in 1921 the Secretary of the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society of England, addressed a letter to the president of the

Saint Catherine Welfare Association, an American society of Catholic women formed for the purpose of improving the condition of women and children especially through enlightened social legislation. She asked the coöperation of this latter organisation in having amended the article on "Woman" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, a new edition of which was being considered at the time. As will be recalled, the offending article in that great American Catholic publication was written by an Austrian, Father Rössler, and was not distinguished by an up-to-date treatment of its theme. The particular paragraph, however, about which the English Catholic suffragists wished to rouse protests in the United States, was one in which the contributor asserted that "The female sex is in some respects inferior to the male sex, both as regards body and soul."⁸⁵

At the Birmingham Congress in August, 1923, Archbishop Keating observed that it could be said that Leo XIII's great Encyclical on the Condition of the Working Classes was largely due to English and American thought. He went on to say that they should not lose sight of the United States where great interest in their work had been aroused. He hoped that some time they would send over an official representative to get thoroughly in touch with their American brethren.⁸⁶

Contacts have become increasingly frequent between English and American Catholics interested in social reform. For example, Dr. James Ryan, Dr. Lapp, Dr. Patrick Brown and Mr. Foster Stearns came from the United States to assist at the Congress which was held at Oxford in 1925.⁸⁷

ENGLISH CATHOLICS AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL ACTION

In addition to these more or less personal and incidental contacts, English Catholics have joined with their coreligionists of other lands in organised international action. Back in 1883, Windthorst, in acknowledging greetings sent to German Catholics, assembled at Düsseldorf for the Catholic Congress, by the Catholic Union of Great Britain in the name of the Catholics of Eng-

land, voiced his hope of an "International Union of the Catholics of the World" which should be a grand international association for the defense of the rights of the Church. Nothing came of this ambitious scheme.³⁸

It was the twentieth century which gave the greatest impetus to concerted international effort. "Membership of the Catholic or universal Church," commented the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1913, "brings with it facilities for that international social action which is the dream of reformers.

"This fact suggests an additional reason why Catholics should interest themselves in social action; their religion not only supplies them with sound principles and motives, but it also provides the machinery for international social action, without which advance in one country may be retarded by backwardness in another. Thus, for example, efforts to secure a living wage or to stop the White Slave Traffic or to abolish war can be completely successful only when they are made simultaneously in every land; and the Catholic Church, by her world-wide organisation, makes such concerted action possible." One of the purposes of the Guild was to familiarise Catholics in England with the social action of their fellow-Catholics in other lands, and to promote an international solidarity amongst Catholic workers. Some of the English societies cited as members of international organisations were the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the Catholic Women's League, the Society for Befriending Girls and the Catholic Peace Association.³⁹

Twelve years later a writer in *Le Correspondant* made similar mention of the anomalous possibilities of Catholicism for international action: "Le premier fait que l'examen des circonstances présentes met en lumière, c'est la puissance d'adaptation aux besoins les plus varies des pays et des temps qui distingue la religion catholique—En ce qui concerne la solution des problèmes internationaux, elle a sur les États temporels cette supériorité que les obstacles à l'action efficace ne la gênent, tandis, que les qualités dont le privilège leur manque sont précisément les siennes."⁴⁰

At the time of the movement for Catholic Confederation which

took shape at the Catholic Congress at Leeds in August, 1910, the Bishop of Salford pointed out that a fully representative National Confederation would be a valuable agency for the effecting of such international confederation as already existed between the various Catholic Women's Leagues.⁴¹

It fell to the lot of the English delegate to the gathering convened by the various Liges Sociales d'Acheteurs at Antwerp in September, 1913, to explain the recent developments under the Trade Boards Act. Encouraged by his account of this alleviation of the lot of sweated workers, the Congress passed a resolution urging an active propaganda in all countries in favour of a minimum wage for all home workers to be fixed by some form of Trade Board.⁴²

At the International Conference of Catholic Women's Leagues which took place in Vienna in September, 1912, it was decided to hold the next meeting in London, and the leadership of the Union was confided to the Catholic Women's League of England. The English women assumed with this leadership the heavier responsibility of preparing the statutes of the international association for submission to the Holy See, in order that the Union might secure papal recognition as a Catholic international organisation. The work of revising the statutes was accomplished at the very successful International Conference in London, June 25-29, 1913, and afterward they were approved and ratified for four years by the Holy Father. In addition to the task of putting the statutes in final form, the conference gave time to the consideration of such questions as the modern theater, the modern press, Catholic education, and the suppression of the white slave traffic. A correspondent to *America* from London in July wrote with regard to the Catholic Women's League of England: "The Catholic Women's League of England, whose admirable achievements are well known, effaced itself on this occasion in order to give scope for the exposition by its foreign sisters, of conditions and modes of organisation in other countries."⁴³

Miss Margaret Fletcher, in an illuminating article written for the London *Month* in September of the same year, dealt with the

origin and purposes of this far-flung movement. The well-organised *Ligue Patriotique des Françaises* had taken the initiative and the first international meeting took place in Brussels in August, 1910, the whole movement originating to a large extent as a reaction against the un-Christian tendencies of the undenominational Congress of Women held in 1906. It had responded, nevertheless, to a widespread if inarticulate longing of Catholic women to widen their horizon and participate more fully in the affairs of the day. At the London Conference the British women were struck with admiration at the ability and zeal of the delegates from France and Germany. The congress planned for 1915 was to have been devoted entirely to a consideration of the white slave traffic. Miss Fletcher said that this horror flourished on "woman's ignorance, her failure to earn a living wage which makes her eager to trust lying advertisements, and most of all on the uncared-for feeble-minded." She rejoiced in the "growing recognition of the fact that most evils flourish best in darkness and in silence and that to these an awakened public conscience is as remedial as is sunlight to disease."

"Hitherto," she wrote, "with a few notable exceptions, Catholic women have not roused themselves in this matter or borne their share in the labour of fighting this infamy." Miss Fletcher hoped for a time when, with the development of social study in England, Germany would not be the only country to furnish a constructive literature on social questions as they affected women. "We want and want badly a literature not confined to warnings, negations and proofs of fallacious arguments or historical blunders, but one positive, constructive, pulsing with life, both natural and supernatural."⁴⁴

Cardinal Bourne sent a long letter to the International Congress of Catholic students which assembled at Prague in 1921. English representatives played their part in this, the first congress of its kind, and the English also participated, four years later, in the International Congress of Catholic Youth which was held at Rome.⁴⁵

England was represented at the First International Democratic

Congress held in Paris, December 4-11, 1921. This was organised by Marc Sangnier, deputy of the French Chamber and director of the publications *La Démocratie* and *La Jeune République*. It was not a distinctively Catholic Congress, although the Catholic delegates outnumbered by approximately sixty-five per cent those who were adherents of the Protestant religions. But Christian principles inspired the lofty purpose of the meeting—namely, the disarmament of hate among nations without which all naval and military disarmament would be in vain—and furnished the guiding lines for the deliberations. These covered a wide field. For example, a survey was made of employers' and employees' associations and of coöperative societies as a means of social peace and as institutions of democracy.⁴⁶

FIRST EFFORTS OF BRITISH CATHOLICS IN BEHALF OF INTERNATIONAL ACCORD

The participation by English Catholics in this congress is illustrative of their interest in efforts to bring Catholic principles to bear upon those widest of all social relationships, those involved in intercourse between nations with a view to eliminating ultimately armed conflict from the affairs of the world. The principles themselves are older than Christendom, radicated, according to the teaching of the Church, in the natural and the revealed law, and opposed in essence to the modern anarchistic concept of the State as subject to no jurisdiction higher than its own interpretation of its rights. They have been declared and expounded by Church Fathers, theologians and sovereign pontiffs. It was St. Isidore of the seventh century who introduced a more precise terminology for the differentiation of international from other forms of law. Pius XI in his Encyclical on St. Thomas issued in 1923 expressed the hope that "the doctrines of Aquinas concerning the ruling of peoples and the laws which establish their relations with one another may be better known, since they contain the true foundation of that which is termed the 'League of Nations.' " ⁴⁷

The Catholics of England realising that the ability to recognise Christian principles is not miraculously bestowed on people by knowledge infused from on high, that these principles do not operate automatically, and that desolation has been spread no less through ignorance than through vice—have been doing their part, as we shall see, to diffuse the Catholic doctrine of international relations. This doctrine places the divine law above national expediency, inculcates a belief in the fatherhood of God and the essential brotherhood of all nations and all races of mankind, and insists that the precepts of Christian justice and Christian charity be observed as punctiliously by one nation in its dealings with another as they are—or ought to be—observed in the social relations and business transactions of private citizens.⁴⁸

There is also a Catholic doctrine on war, to the elucidation of which English Catholics have likewise made their contribution. It is, briefly, this: that war is an evil which would not exist if human society were dominated by the moral law. Taking things as they are, however, it may in rare instances be resorted to as a last recourse in defense of justice—to combat, in short, a greater evil than itself. Its total abolition is by no means impossible, but is contingent on a change of mind and heart among the masses of mankind and the statesmen who control the fate of nations.

These ideas have found reiterated expression in Catholic teaching. St. Augustine did not hesitate to brand war as brigandage on a large scale; the great Schoolmen regarded it as at best a clumsy expedient for the settlement of inter-state disputes; while from the beginning the Church made repeated efforts to mitigate the horrors of the conflicts which actually took place—as witness, for example, the restrictions imposed by the Peace of God and the Truce of God during the political turmoil of the Middle Ages. Modern Popes have given eloquent expression to their zeal for world peace. The contributions of Leo XIII alone to this subject are considerable and profound. His successors, Pius X, Benedict XV and Pius XI, have in their turn raised their voices in appeals for international accord.⁴⁹

In 1868 a group of English Catholics took steps at Rome for

the establishment of a college of International Law under the direction of the Holy See. A number of their Protestant compatriots, who shared their eagerness to see the law of nations brought once more into harmony with Christian principles, addressed to the Holy See a petition to the same effect; and the well-known English diplomatist, David Urquhart, was the author of the famous *Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope for the re-establishment of International Law*.⁵⁰

It will be recalled that among the varied interests of Cardinal Manning was a zeal for world peace. He was one of the vice-presidents of the League for Peace, and at its fifth annual Congress in June, 1888, he denounced the militarism of Europe and urged the erection of a tribunal of supreme arbitration in its stead. He regarded great political aggregations as more conducive to peace than numbers of small independent communities. Had he lived to see the succession of Balkan crises, freighted as they were with awful consequences for the peace of the world, he might have been stiffened in his theory.

Toward the close of the year 1895, President Cleveland nearly precipitated war between Great Britain and the United States by a bellicose message to congress in which he asked authority to appoint a commission to settle the then existing boundary dispute between Venezuela and British Guiana, the findings of which should be imposed by force if necessary upon Great Britain. He made this extraordinary move in the interests of the Monroe Doctrine. Fortunately, the English Government maintained a calm attitude and serious trouble was averted. The incident, however, brought to the fore the question of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States.

Cardinal Vaughan gave his strong personal support and the prestige of his position to the proposal to establish some permanent means of arbitration between the two countries. He told a member of the staff of the *Daily Chronicle* that for twenty-five years he had thought and said that disputes between nations ought to be settled by reasonable arbitration and not by resort to arms. "If the present friction between England and the United

States should bring into existence an international tribunal of arbitration, the benefit that those English-speaking nations would thus confer on humanity would be worthy of their great mission in the world.”⁵¹

The London *Tablet*, showing its interest in the question of arbitration for its own sake, reproduced in its columns an account of an interview granted to Sir John Lubbock by a representative of the *St. James Gazette*. Like Cobden Sir John believed that the growth of English and American commerce made war between the two countries impracticable. And the strong ties between the two peoples rendered it fratricidal.⁵²

As pride of race in days of old and an exaggerated sense of the claims of nationality in more recent times have been productive of wars and rumours of war, it is not unfitting to set down some of the thoughts which these ideas evoked from the mind of Charles Stanton Devas. “It was the very mission of Christianity from the beginning,” he wrote in his *Key to the World’s Progress*, “to break down the barriers that separated Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, Roman and Scythian; and thereby to come into conflict with the strongest sentiments of natural man. . . . But the sense of racial superiority is far from being confined to barbarians. The Jews of old, conscious of inalienable superiority of birth, looked on Roman and Greek, Syrian and Egyptian with ineffable arrogance and scorn. And as the world in their view was divided into Jew and Gentile, so to Greek eyes into Greeks and barbarians. A similar national pride is cherished among the leading and active nations of modern civilisation, and their sense of superiority and their contempt of the foreigner, whether latent or expressed, is generally in proportion to their temporal success.” He cited the French as “la grande nation,” the English of the “forties” and “fifties” of the nineteenth century and latterly, the growing national pride of Germans and Americans. “Nor are such feelings a harmless and laughable weakness. Alas! the world is full of all too earnest racial antagonism. There is scarce a country great or small, that is not troubled with bitter strife of language and colour, outward and unmistakable

signs abused by a perversity, at once human and inhuman, to separate those who should be brothers in Christ." The word "nationalism," he explained, could be taken in two senses. It might mean either the perfectly permissible effort of one nationality—like the Poles—to prevent absorption by another, or an anti-Christian desire to place country or race above the law of God and the dictates of charity.⁵³

THE CATHOLIC PEACE ASSOCIATION

In 1910 the Catholic Peace Association was founded. It was established under the presidency of Cardinal Bourne and had for its aim the organisation of Catholic opinion for the purpose of contributing toward the widespread movement in favour of universal arbitration and peace, and of inculcating a desire for universal peace on Catholic principles. Its methods were these: united daily prayer for the objects of the organisation; the encouragement of a spirit of conciliation in private and public life; the production and distribution of literature on the Catholic aspect of questions relating to peace and war; periodic meetings for the discussion of peace propaganda and allied topics, and the inculcation of peace principles in the training of the young.⁵⁴

The first year was one of tentative effort, but in July, 1911, the association was definitely organised. The previous month it was represented at the National Peace Congress held in Edinburgh by the Rev. M. Power, S.J., and by Miss F. M. Macdonald. Mrs. V. M. Crawford represented the C. P. A. at the Catholic Congress at Newcastle and at the inaugural meeting of the Catholic International League for Peace with which it became affiliated,—the president of the English branch being "ex-officio" vice-president of the League. In October of the same year the English bishops unanimously approved the formation of diocesan peace associations in connection with that in London.⁵⁵

The Catholic Peace Association began its second year by a public meeting held at Battersea on February 29, 1912. The Rev. Vincent McNabb addressed a large audience on "The

Friends and Foes of Peace." He was unsparing in his denunciation of scheming financiers who in the guise of patriotism clamoured for war in order to increase their banking accounts. Some people had claimed that universal peace was an impossibility. A man must have a curious knowledge of history if he found in it any justification for war. History, went on the speaker, was a record of the entire futility of the appeal to war. Though we were perhaps on the level of Dante and Shakespeare in matters of literature, in matters of arbitration we were still on the level of the jackal and the wolf. Prior McNabb denounced those who were opposed to peace, such as designing politicians, enterprising financiers, unscrupulous newspaper writers and the like. If any man argued that he could never banish war from the world, he would reply: "I never said I would, but I am going to work as if I might."⁵⁶

Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson, a delegate of the association to the National Peace Congress in London, preached to a great throng in Westminster Cathedral on May 19, 1912. He denounced the mob passions that led to war. An individual was not permitted to vindicate his honour at the expense of his neighbour's blood, and society did not allow a tradesman to cut the throat of a rival because his own business needed expansion. Yet Christians apparently believed that if Germany needed expansion for her empire, and England thought her reputation at stake, the two countries would be justified in fighting each other.⁵⁷

In the same year he contributed an article to the *North American Review* entitled "Cosmopolitanism and Catholicism." Increased facilities for travel and communication had made cosmopolitanism suddenly effective. A fluid, he declared, as new now as was the essence of Imperialism once, had begun to stream not only on the wires but through the very miles of air. The result was largely a decrease of the old patriotism. Household gods, tribal deities and national churches were the natural and inevitable outcome of each bond of unity in its expanding development, since, whatever might be the truth or the falsehood of any given religion, man in the long run would insist on some

species of faith. The sincere cosmopolitan must cast away not only his narrow nationalism or his temperamental individuality, but the national church of his fathers and his long-cherished private judgment in matters of belief. Catholicism, he concluded, was the religion which would meet the cosmopolitan demand not only by reason of its worldwide scope, but because as a supernatural religion it would obliterate the lines between sage and fool by furnishing a faith transcendent of both because constructed outside of the individual mind.⁵⁸

Mr. Alexander Johnston represented the Catholic Peace Association at the first Catholic International Peace Congress held in Paris in June of that year, where a new Catholic league known as The International Association for the Study of the Law of Nations according to Christian Principles was formed. M. Vaaderpol, president of the League of French Catholics for the Preservation of Peace, contributed an account of that group to the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1913. It was believed that the time had come for a fresh exposition and vindication of Christian International Law by the encouragement of the publication of works setting forth the teaching of the Church in regard to the Law of Nations, the duties of civilised peoples in their dealings with the uncivilised and the reciprocal duties of nations. An editorial note was appended to this article in which the hope was expressed that English Catholics would play their part in this work, a preliminary sketch of which had been drawn up at the Congress held at Louvain during the previous autumn. It was decided to collect pertinent books or analytic résumés. The historical work was to be assigned in sections to experts, and a study of the philosophical and theological aspects of the principles of international law was projected. Among the members of the English committee were Monsignor Parkinson, Dr. Mooney, Father Plater and Mrs. Crawford.⁵⁹

The Catholic Peace Association issued a leaflet, *The Popes and Peace*, designed to show how entirely the Peace Movement had the sympathy and active encouragement of the Sovereign Pontiff. Father Keating represented the association at Norwich.

Earlier in the year he had delivered a lecture on "Catholicism and Peace" which was published by the Catholic Truth Society. He opened the discussion of his subject with an allusion to the "Christ of the Andes," the colossal statue erected at the summit of a lofty mountain pass between Chile and Argentina in 1904 to commemorate the settling of a boundary dispute of long standing between the two countries and their common resolve to beat their swords into ploughshares and remain forever at peace with each other. In answering the question, Why has not Catholicism produced Peace? he explained that the principle of nationality had escaped from the control of the Church. In a section on the influence of the professional fighting-man as a barrier to peace he made the following wise incursion into the realm of psychology: "If only convention had determined that the armies of industry should be clothed and decorated and marshalled as are the armies of destruction, militarism would have been shorn of its unfair advantage. The wise municipality of the future, we may hope, will clothe its officials in gorgeous uniforms. Policeman and motorman, postman and messenger boy, will gleam with purple and gold, and organised labour be resplendent with regimental badges. Thus something will be done to show that peace hath her loveliness no less than war."⁶⁰

The Catholic Peace Association continued to grow. Miss Owen, the delegate to the National Peace Congress held in Leeds in 1913, reported a most successful meeting and a wholehearted sympathy with the cause on the part of the delegates. In May of the same year the secretary of the organisation gave two addresses on "The Great Illusion"—one in the rooms of the Catholic Women's League at London, where an animated discussion took place, and the other before a non-sectarian audience at Islington.⁶¹

Strangely enough the Lenten Pastoral issued by the Bishop of Salford in the spring which preceded the fateful summer of 1914 was devoted to *The Church and Peace*. After a lengthy discussion of Christianity and peace, he praised the peace movement of the close of the nineteenth and the opening of the twentieth century and called attention to the staunch advocacy of this cause

by Pope Leo XIII. Catholics should be leaders in the movement to ward off from Europe the perils of war. He counselled those who could to associate themselves with some of the approved societies which aimed at the substitution of arbitration for war and the bringing about of friendly union amongst various races and nations.⁶²

PREPARATIONS FOR WORLD PEACE IN THE MIDST OF WORLD WAR

During the War, Father Charles Dominic Plater, whose work on behalf of the Catholic Social Guild has been considered, devoted a great deal of attention to the subject of international relations. On November 9, 1914, he went to Birmingham to attend an interdenominational committee meeting. His suggestion of the subject, "International and Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity" as the topic for the next year's summer school at Swanwick was accepted. At Swanwick in the following June he found himself one of a Catholic group of seven. He was chosen to give the closing address which should sum up the ideas which had been brought before the conference. They had, he declared, gained a better and more sympathetic understanding of each other and a deeper realisation of their common aim, coupled with an intensified enthusiasm in their resolution to prosecute it. Their purpose was to help to secure for Europe and the world a positive and a permanent peace, which would be effected only by the observance of international morality, their common recognition of the paramount claims of which was not compromised by their religious differences. Unless, however, they recognised the fact that what was a platitude to them might be a startling revelation to other people they might overlook the great work of moral propaganda which lay before them. He restated with comment the important points brought out by the different speakers—Mr. Clutton Brock, the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Wicksteed, Mr. Zimmern and others, some of whom had warned of the growing spirit of impatience of all moral restraint showing itself in platform and press. The War must not be won at *any* cost—not at the cost of wrongdoing. He suggested the morality of reprisals

as one of the subjects of study for the coming autumn. "We are all united," he declared, "in our main purpose of securing a stable peace by Christian action."⁶³

In the fall of 1915, Plater turned his attention to the subject of international law in consequence of a visit paid to him by Francis Urquhart of Balliol College, Oxford. From that time the subject was to occupy him a great deal and to inspire various pamphlets and other publications.⁶⁴

By far his most important and permanently valuable production on topics born of his interest in the war which was being waged and in the peace which should one day prevail was his *Primer of Peace and War*. Of this he was not the sole author. Much of the historical part was the work of Mr. Urquhart; his fellow-Jesuits, Fathers Keating and Monoel, contributed special sections, and Canon William Barry also assisted in the compilation. The uniquely practical and comprehensive nature of this work explains the unprecedented attention which it received from the non-Catholic press.⁶⁵

Meanwhile other members of the Catholic Social Guild were concerned with similar problems. The *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1915 was devoted, as has been recorded, to domestic problems arising out of England's participation in the War. One section, however, dealt with a topic relevant to the subject under consideration. Mr. Urquhart contributed an article on "The Breakdown of International Morality." The War, he asserted, was not only a scandal to Christianity in general, but an especial defeat for the Catholic spirit of unity. Why had the Catholic ideal failed in the crisis? One of the causes of the War was the extravagant growth of nationalism, with its own gospel and its own code, and with its legitimisation of intervention on behalf of subject nationalities. Following the fall of the old international law of the eighteenth century had come a great vagueness on the subject in the minds of the people which had to be cleared away. Though elucidation of the principles of international morality should be a task congenial to all men of good will, it was, he declared, a work for which the Church with its rich storehouses

of principles and its cosmopolitan character was especially adapted. To this study the Catholics of England might profitably apply themselves.⁶⁶

The Guild brought before at least a section of the public a Catholic commentary on Pope Benedict's peace note which at the time had aroused violent criticism. In August, 1917, at Plater's request Father Martindale wrote a few pages of comment, setting forth the significance and value of the note, which were added to the text of the document and published as the first of the Catholic Social Guild Law of Nations Series. Sixty thousand copies were sold in a short time.⁶⁷

The second pamphlet of the series took up the various *Replies to the Pope's Appeal* and the remaining four leaflets dealt with the subject of International Law. Gertrude Robinson was the author of the third and fifth, which considered respectively the *Law of Nations: What it Is* and *National Courts and International Law*. In the latter she reviewed the attempt begun in 1814 to rule the world by Congresses and dismissed as undesirable the idea of a league of nations, suggesting instead the setting up of national tribunals each of which should try all causes of war between its own nation and another. Mr. F. F. Urquhart, the son of the famous publicist whose idea of national tribunals so intrigued Miss Robinson, wrote the fourth pamphlet called *The Restoration of the Law of Nations*. Drawing a distinction between the state and the nation, he alluded to the appeals that were made to the Rights of Nationalities as justification for breaking up existing states, transferring provinces from one to another and carrying on agitations in other countries. Once more he called for some re-statement of the old formularies of the Law of Nations in order to apply fundamental and unchanging principles to modern conditions. The sixth and last of the series was devoted to a consideration of *The Free Seas in Peace and War*, and was the work of M. Sidney Parry. This subject on which Benedict XV and Woodrow Wilson had laid so much emphasis could not be regarded as an anomalous topic for discussion amongst social students.⁶⁸

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Toward the end of the War Cardinal Bourne, who had been eloquent in his pleas for peace with justice, was cautious on the subject of the proposed League of Nations. He wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on October 22, 1918, in which, after declining to be present or represented at a meeting to discuss the project, he commented:

"I suppose that we are all agreed that the project of a League of Nations deserves our support. But . . . the question is pre-eminently an international question, and one distinctly for international statesmanship. It is the statesmen alone who can work out the details of any practicable scheme; and, so far as I know, they have hardly begun to do so. I think we may easily place ourselves in a false position in the eyes of non-British statesmanship if we anticipate the work that statecraft has to do.

"If a workable scheme can be devised, it goes without saying that it will have the support of Catholics throughout the world . . ." ⁶⁹

Mr. Samuel F. Darwin Fox ascribed a Catholic origin to the League of Nations, in an article published in the London *Universe* entitled "Sixtus V's League of Nations." That sixteenth century pontiff, anxious to put an end to the international disputes and bloodshed of the times and realising that physical sanction was necessary for the moral force with which he intended to confront the armed Europe of his day, devised a plan by which the Papal States should become the citadel of a military police force powerful enough, as he once wrote, ". . . to deliver the oppressed; to judge the princes and to arbitrate in their quarrels; to transfer, if need be, the balance of power from one nation to another; to maintain peace . . . to insist upon disarmament . . . and to punish the recalcitrant." Sixtus died before he could test the value of his scheme.⁷⁰

On the occasion of the repudiation of Woodrow Wilson by his own countrymen, Shane Leslie dwelt with enthusiasm on what had been the great social mission of the American president, and

saw in his fall the collapse of the hopes of a generation. "If he was too late in entering the war," wrote Mr. Leslie, "he was far too soon in proposing his Plan of peace. The Allies he saved; himself he could not save. Over his prostrate form the angry and disappointed and perhaps wilful nations march on to find that the Ultimate Peace will be much what Wilson dreamed."⁷¹

Mention has been made of the participation by England in the first International Democratic Congress, preponderantly Catholic in its personnel, which was held in Paris at the end of 1921. Its very atmosphere was conciliatory, for German and Austrian delegates took their places at the meetings beside the representatives of the former allied nations. A study was made of the various organisations and movements aiming at the cultivation of a spirit of peace. The League of Nations, as an agency for peace, was subjected to careful inquiry because of the feeling among the congressists that, as constituted, the League was rather an instrument in the hands of diplomats for the realisation of national aspirations than a power faithfully representative of the real interests for peace among mankind.⁷²

Cardinal Bourne, preaching in Westminster Cathedral in the spring of 1923, said that the Catholics in different countries had gladly given their support and encouragement to the League of Nations and had recognised and praised such measure of success as the League had already attained. But he deplored the fact that its organisers had not sought the counsel and support of the supreme authority of the Catholic Church and feared that their failure to do so would be fraught with serious consequences to the life of the League. The Cardinal had given his sympathetic interest to L'Union Catholique D'Etudes Internationales, a Continental society to study international questions in the light of Christian principles and secure the solution of such problems in a Catholic spirit. To this end, the organisers expressed a special intention of taking an interest in the League of Nations.⁷³

In the summer of 1923 the establishment of a Catholic Council of Foreign Relations was proposed at a session of the Knights

of St. Columba held in Birmingham University. According to the member proposing the resolution the animating principle of such a council should be the replacement of national insularity by coöperation between nations.⁷⁴

Further impetus was given to this idea at the conference held in the ancient city of Reading in the autumn of the same year. The topic chosen for discussion was "The Catholic Citizen: His National and International Responsibilities," and in its elucidation not only English Catholics but representatives of other countries and Catholic Members of the League of Nations participated. This was in keeping with the purpose of the conference which was to promote more cordial relationships between nations and improve the machinery for lessening the possibility of war. The conference concerned itself not with civics but with the ethical aspects of International Politics. The sessions were almost wholly deliberative—and purposely so. It was the intent of the organisers to elicit careful utterances on the subject of the "Jus Gentium" from Catholic scholars and to give the laity a chance to increase their knowledge and clarify their concepts concerning the League of Nations. "Nobody set light to a display of rhetorical fireworks," wrote the *Tablet*, "or predicted the beginning of the millennium by next New Year's Day. In short, the chief work done was the clearing of the ground."⁷⁵

In the autumn of 1923 Father Keating urged Catholics not to join the materialist and the militarist in their disposition to accept the failure reflected in the European situation but rather to seek out the causes of the deplorable conditions and apply the remedies anew. He offered the practical suggestion that national history should be read and taught in the light of Christian principles. "Our textbooks should be thoroughly purged of Jingoism and every sentiment that savours of racial pride. The crimes and follies of the past should be called by their right names and not excused on the plea of national exigencies: and justice should be done to other nations, at any rate, by not arrogating to ourselves rights which we deny to them. As no education which does not qualify its subject to be a good citizen can be thought adequate,

so some training in the principles of true internationalism is essential.”⁷⁶

The following spring he called attention to the evils of unfettered nationalism, evils which Catholics, because of their more precise moral teaching, were the more to be blamed for promoting. He urged the latter to support the League of Nations and concluded that nationalism, if tempered and guided by Catholic principles, was a blessing; otherwise it might be a curse.⁷⁷

The movement for improved international relations went on amongst English Catholics throughout the year 1924. On more than one occasion Father Martindale used his versatile gifts to urge Catholics to coöperate internationally in the interest of the precepts and the causes which they held dear. Other agencies, such as purely humanitarian ones, had made their influence felt throughout the world. The Catholics of other countries looked to those of England for sympathy and aid. He urged the abandonment of the curse of nationalism, by which he meant anything that provoked hostile feeling to or derisive or unfriendly allusion to any country whatsoever.⁷⁸

Concerning the attitude of the Catholic hierarchy toward the League of Nations, Cardinal Bourne wrote as follows to the Prime Minister:

“Understanding that at this moment an earnest appeal is being addressed to you by many who are representative in this country of Christian life and thought, in favour of the policies now embodied in the League of Nations, my colleagues in the Episcopate of England and Wales, who are assembled here for their annual meeting, desire to unite themselves with me in associating ourselves most gladly with such appeal. We do so the more readily because we recognise that in the League of Nations a real endeavour is being made to carry into effect those principles of international justice and good will which the Catholic Church, by the voice of the Holy See, has never failed to urge upon the conscience of the world.”⁷⁹

The Peace Movement amongst European Catholics had begun during the War with the founding in 1916 of the World Peace

League of the White Cross. After the armistice of 1918 such action became more practicable. In August, 1920, under the leadership of the Dutch group the first Catholic Peace Congress met at The Hague. Other meetings took place at The Hague in 1921, at Luxemburg in 1922, and at Constance in 1923. In the same year, the German group which had organised the Peace League of German Catholics convened a conference at Freiburg in Baden. The League of French Catholics for International Justice had been very active, and the Correspondance Franco-Allemande was founded which had for its purpose the building up of friendly relations between French and German households by means of correspondence by letter. The Reading Conference of the previous autumn marked the entrance of English Catholics into this far-flung movement.⁸⁰

THE CATHOLIC COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

It was appropriate that the year 1925, the year designated throughout the Catholic world as the "Holy Year" should be one given over by the Catholics of Great Britain to unprecedented activity on behalf of international accord. The Catholic Council for International Relations took the field. The origin of this organisation dates back to the four day Conference which took place at Reading in October, 1923. It was formally established on Corpus Christi Day of 1924, after the scheme had received the approval of the hierarchy of England and Wales at their Easter Conference.

Emphasis must be laid on the fact that in accordance with the intention of its promoters the C. C. I. R. was not established as a separate Catholic organisation with a distinctive aim. In the opinion of its founders it would have been productive of more harm than good to commit aims so important and so comprehensive to the exclusive guardianship of one small group. The Council is a sort of joint committee composed of men and women able and willing for the task delegated by their respective organisations—the Catholic Social Guild, the Catholic Medical Guild, the

Catholic Women's League, the Catholic Education Council, for example—to work for the objects of the Council, that is, to strive for unity of action amongst Catholics of all nations on matters pertaining to their faith, and to promote the cause of international peace. The Council is political in the sense that it concerns itself with affairs commonly called political and which, being human affairs, cannot be extraneous to the moral law. But it is strictly non-partisan, in its avoidance of identification with any of the great English political parties.

Although the main work before the Council was educative it was not long before its executive committee engaged in activities of a practical character. It drew up statements on the League of Nations and on the economic causes of friction between states. It likewise pledged itself to work for the recognition of the Holy See by the League of Nations, and to protest against the unjust treatment of minorities in defiance of the precepts of international law.⁸¹

During 1925 the Council brought its work conspicuously before the public on two occasions. Late in April it began a series of meetings in the diocese of Westminster, which extended into the following month; and in August it held a summer school at Oxford. It was planned to devote the London Conference to a consideration of the status and position of the papacy. This was consonant with the claim of the Council that relations should be established between the Holy See and the League of Nations on terms acceptable to the Pope. One of the addresses at the conference dealt with "The Catholic Church and the League of Nations" and was delivered by Father Joseph Keating. He said that the League was a real and urgent necessity which stood between them and the collapse of civilisation. As a universal alliance it possessed all the advantages and none of the drawbacks of those sectional groupings which nations regarded as necessities but which only bred counter-alliances and a more terrible clash of interests in the end. He was of the opinion that the success of the League was dependent on its securing the backing of the Holy See.⁸²

Bishop Brown, Father Owen Dudley and Father Leslie Walter preached sermons in which they stressed the religious and moral background needed to make efficacious the will for peace. Henry Somerville and Francis Urquhart brought their views before the conference. Mr. Somerville called on Catholics to support and improve the League of Nations as a definite if imperfect step forward in the progress of political evolution; and Mr. Urquhart, with regard to the subject of wars, urged a campaign against an all too prevalent double ignorance, the ignorance of law and the ignorance of facts. At the final meeting, Father Bede Jarrett urged Catholics to use their influence to bring about international peace.⁸³

The Council sought and received recognition from abroad. One month after its formation it took part in the congress of the International Catholic League held at Lugano. By its secretary, John Eppstein, it sent an invitation to the *Federation Nationale Catholique* in France, of which General de Castelnau was president, to take part in the conference planned for August. To this Castelnau sent a cordial reply.⁸⁴

Of even greater significance was the recognition accorded by the Pope. Cardinal Bourne received the following letter, dated June 8, 1925, at the Vatican Secretariate of State:

"Your Eminence,—

The August Pontiff considers that each and every assembly of Catholics is to be encouraged, but holds that today those in particular should be convened whose aim is to draw daily closer the bonds of charity between men, and diffuse through the entire Church and among the nations that which is so truly akin to charity, peace and concord.

Hence it is with great delight that the Most Holy Father has heard that the Catholic Council for International Relations has not long since held successful meetings in London, and is soon to have another conference at Oxford. Since, then, today more than ever, the enemies of the Christian Name vie with each other to exasperate evil will and hostility, it assuredly is for us to seek both to coerce so ill an enterprise and to lay bare their craft and treachery, so that those who have been seduced by empty

argument to abandon the right road should at the last be happily restored to a sound mind and action. His Holiness, therefore, with fatherly love congratulates you who are contributing both energy and thought to this end, and begs for you the heavenly enlightenment and powerful aid of God.”⁸⁵

Catholic groups in other lands accepted invitations to be present at Oxford where the general subject selected for discussion was “Catholic Principles Concerning Race and Nationality.” Among these foreign organisations was one little known to Englishmen, called I. K. A. or International Catholic League, the purpose of which was to work out and propagate fundamental but obscured Catholic principles concerning concord between nations. It had long wished to hold one of its international conferences in England. There was also the Union Catholique d’Etudes Internationales, of Fribourg, Switzerland, which might be destined to do the preliminary work for an epoch-making Encyclical on the principles of right and justice that should exist between nations, as the Union de Fribourg had prepared the ground for Pope Leo’s great pronouncement on Christian principles governing the rights and duties of social classes within countries.⁸⁶

For eight days representatives of twenty-eight countries and three distinct groups met at Oxford in August. The three assemblies which convened at the invitation of the British Catholic Council for International Relations were: the International Catholic League; the Catholic Social Guild, holding its sixth annual summer school more or less in conjunction with the I. K. A., and itself by that time something of an international social organisation, so frequently and so respectfully was it being consulted by Catholic societies abroad, and a special conference for delegates of central committees for Catholic action, the latter having been called jointly by the International Catholic League, the Catholic Union of International Studies and the International Office of Catholic Organisations of Rome. All united in zeal for the two principal objects of the conference, which were “to promote friendly coöperation in different branches of life between the Catholics of all countries,” and “to make more widely known

Catholic principles concerning the mutual rights and duties of nations in their dealings with one another, according to Catholic tradition in general, and especially according to the pronouncements of the Supreme Pontiff and of his predecessors in modern times.”⁸⁷

Cardinal Bourne in his address at the reception to the delegates rejoiced in the value of such international conferences as a means of rebuilding those courtesies of civilisation which had been so sadly shattered by the War. He looked to that particular conference to become a unique power for good because of the common faith of its members. At the same time he sounded a note of caution. They could be emphatic, he agreed, when principles were in question. But where deduction from principles came into play there might be sharp divergencies of opinion. In such cases he urged them to go slowly and be careful not to commit themselves too rapidly or too readily to definite conclusions. The questions which were to come before the conference had been discussed in past centuries by many great students and theologians. They had now to be reconsidered in the light of new conditions.⁸⁸

Five sessions were given over to the discussion and exposition of Catholic principles as they concerned nationality and race. At the very first session the question, “What is Nationality?” was posited. The main paper on the subject was read by Dr. James Ryan of the Catholic University at Washington. He called attention to the solidarity of the human race which was anterior to any nationality, repudiated the Hegelian concept of the State as an organic being with rights peculiar to itself, and emphasised the belief in the duties of nations which went with the idea of Christian nationalism. Dr. Mack, Director of the Seminary at Luxemburg, urged the essential union of faith and politics. Charity and faith were twin sisters, and Catholic principles making themselves manifest in Parliament, in press—and indeed in all possible quarters—must sway all action towards the ends that make for peace.⁸⁹

The topic, “Self-determination,” occupied the third session. The term “nationality” according to Professor O’Sullivan of the

National University of Ireland, expressed an ideal and an aspiration as much as it described a fact, and statehood was not, as frequently urged, an essential element in the concept. In the fourth session, Herr Doka of Zurich took up the question of the nation and the State. He expounded at length the question of the place of the principle of nationality in a state in which the population is made up of people of different races. Racial minorities in their right to equality and to the development of their own traditions should be assured of the protection of international as well as national law. In the final session, Professor Le Fur of Rennes took up the problem, or the congeries of problems, involved in the topic, "The Nation and the Use of Force." This included reference to the moral teaching of the Church regarding rebellion and war, and the question of foreign intervention to assist or suppress an insurgent nationalist movement.⁹⁰

The conference served as a clearing house for Catholic ideas on internationalism, exemplified the significance of the already existing bond of unity, the possession of a common religious creed, and gave birth to another scheme for Catholic international cooperation. This latter was a definite step in the direction of the unity of Catholic action and world peace, the attainment of which the Catholic Council for International Relations had set as its ultimate goal. A constitution was drafted for a worldwide confederation of national Catholic groups and international Catholic societies, which should function through an assembly, a permanent committee and a secretariat. The headquarters of the new confederation were to be located at the existing International Office at Rome, and the constitution was to be submitted in due time for the approval of the Holy See.⁹¹

As was fitting, the *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1925, issued by the Catholic Social Guild was devoted to the subject "Catholics and the Problem of Peace." The Introduction written by John Eppstein described the origin and programme of the Catholic Council for International Relations, and in the major portion of the book Father Joseph Keating discussed such questions as "The Family of Nations" and "The Catholic Church and Peace,"

and took up the very practical problem, "What Catholics Can Do for Peace." He included a consideration of those points, like the extent of a citizen's responsibility for national acts and the restriction of immigration, to which the application of moral principles had not yet been made and which called in consequence, for diligent study; he quoted the declaration adopted by the executive committee of the C. C. I. R. relative to the League of Nations and the economic causes of friction between States. The Council urged Catholic business men to associate themselves with organisations international in scope as a means of promoting the cause of world peace.⁹²

The brief record of their ideals and achievements contained in this chapter illustrates the extent to which the Catholics of Great Britain have risen to their international responsibilities and to their obligations as members of a universal Church. They are doing their share to achieve the ideal of the Pontificate of Pius XI, "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ." They are working for the dawn of that day when not only Englishmen but the people of every nation "shall be without fear in the land."

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ *Tablet*, Dec. 12, 1925.

² *Dublin Review*, Vol. 70 (1922), p. 149.

³ *Réforme sociale*, Vol. 10, 2nd Series (1890), p. 536; *Journal des Economistes*, Vol. 185 (1890), p. 157.

⁴ Rae, J., *Contemporary Socialism* (New York, 1901), p. 244; *Journal des Economistes*, *Ibid.*, p. 158:

"Signalons toutefois une vive protestation contre le socialisme d'Etat, que Mgr. Freppel a fait entendre au Congrès des juris-consultes catholiques, qui s'est ouvert le 7 octobre à Angers. Après s'être élevé avec force contre 'le veul du socialisme d'Etat qui souffle en ce moment sur toute d'Europe occidentale,' Mgr. l'évêque d'Angers a réfuté les doctrines anti-économiques due Cardinal Manning." The *Times*, Sept. 16, 1890, listed the heads under which fell the resolutions adopted by the Catholic Social Congress at Liège—Popular Press, Professional Schools, Emigration, Information Offices for the People, etc., etc.

⁵ *Tablet*, Mar. 1, 1890, p. 339; *Ibid.*, Aug. 9, 1884, p. 221; *Ibid.*, Feb. 3, 1923, p. 168; Snead-Cox, J. G., *Life of Herbert Cardinal Vaughan*, 2 vols. (London, 1910), Vol. i, p. 436 *et seq.*; *Tablet*, Sept. 15, 1888; *Times* Sept. 10,

1890, p. 5. Cardinal Vaughan, who visited the United States, was interested in improving the condition of the negroes in the South. *Catholic Gazette*, Vol. v (1922), pp. 69, 70.

⁶ Nitti, F., *Catholic Socialism* (London, 1895), p. 325.

⁷ *Oesterreichische Monatschrift für Christliche Sozialreform*, Vol. 6 (1884), p. 283.

⁸ *L'Association catholique*, Vol. xxv, p. 109, et seq.; *Ibid.*, Vol. xvii, p. 442 and Vol. xviii, pp. 61-71; *La Revue Socialiste*, Vol. 3-4 (1886), p. 42. In the previous issue (Dec., 1885), he had mentioned Bagshawe's name amongst the great social Catholics of the day; *La Réforme sociale*, 2nd ser. Vol. 4, Nov. 15, 1887, p. 508 "Je souscris dit-il (Doutreloux) à la déclaration, de Mgr. de Nottingham, qu'il faut que l'Etat intervienne là où sans action publique et législative, le secours nécessaire ne saurait être obtenu, ni l'injustice être redressée."

⁹ Martindale, C., *Charles Dominic Plater* (London, 1922), pp. 61-76, 96, 97, 119, 122.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 139, 280, 315, 323-336; *Father Plater's last address* (Malta, 1921?).

¹¹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 101.

¹² *Ibid.*, 1913, pp. 96-98; *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 124-129; Plater, *The Priest and Social Action* (London, New York, etc., 1914), pp. 122, 123.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 1912, p. 7; *Ibid.*, 1914, p. 20. Regarding Mr. Milligan's paper, the Archbishop declared that "a synod" of Bishops might . . . go over that address and he did not think they could find anything to object to or to improve in it." This praise was all the more remarkable when we reflect that Mr. Milligan had no theological background such as even some of the laity possess, but had risen by dint of his personal efforts to leadership in the working class.

¹⁴ Jørgensen's book is reviewed under the caption "De l'Individualisme au Catholicisme social" by Henri Garrousteigt in *La Revue Canadienne*, Vol. 12 (1913), pp. 97-103; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 7; Plater, *Priest and Social Action*, p. 83.

¹⁵ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 128 et seq., p. 131; *Année Sociale Internationale*, 1910, p. 67; *Ibid.*, 1913, p. 568; *La Lectura*, Vol. 10: 1 (1910), pp. 278-291. The quotation is to be found on page 290.

¹⁶ *La Lectura*, Vol. 13:3 (1913), p. 92; *Catholic Social Year Book*, pp. 52, 53 for an account of C. W. L. activities in 1913, 1914.

¹⁷ *Times*, March 6, 1920; *America*, Nov. 6, 1920. This is a discussion of an article in *La Croix* by its Madrid correspondent.

¹⁸ *Année Sociale Internationale*, 1910, p. 89; Vausard, *L'Intelligence catholique en Italie dans le XXme. siècle*. (Paris, 1921), Ch. 2 gives an account not only of Toniolo but of other leaders in the Social Catholic Movement in Italy.

¹⁹ Vausard, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

²⁰ Capececiatro, *Christ, the Church and Man* (St. Louis, 1909), pp. 73, 74. The extract cited is taken from an address on "La Question Sociale e il Catholicismo."

²¹ *Rivista Internazionale*, Vol. 100 (1924), pp. 309-311. See also *Catholic*

Social Year Book, 1924, p. 12; *Catholic News*, Aug. 16, 1924; *Universe*, Aug. 22, 1924.

²² *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, p. 30; *Ibid.*, 1912, p. 7.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1912, p. 49; Plater, *Priest and Social Action*, pp. 66, 67.

²⁴ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1910, p. 73.

²⁵ Plater, C. D., *Catholic Social Work in Germany* (London, etc., 1909), pp. 99-104; *Ibid.*, pp. 115, 116.

²⁶ Plater, *Priest and Social Action*, p. 62; Plater, *Catholic Social Work in Germany*, pp. 132, 133. As a sample of a sort of three-cornered contact there may be mentioned the review of this latter work of Plater's in the *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, the organ of the Central Verein, a German-American Catholic society for social reform. The author was praised as "einer der jungen Männer auf welche die Kirche, die Gesellschaft Jesu und die Katholiken in England mit Recht grosse Hoffnungen setzen"; and "Das Werkchen" itself "gibt auch uns hier in Amerika manche nützliche Winke und dürfte besonders in den Händen der jüngeren Generation, vor Allem in Bibliotheka von Jünglings-Vereinen, Sodalitäten u. s. w. viel Gutes stiften." *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, Jan. 1910, pp. 3-5.

²⁷ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, p. 42; *Ibid.*, 1913, pp. 107-112; *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 139, 140; *C. S. G. Bulletin*, Vol. 2 (1916), pp. 68, 69.

²⁸ *America*, Apr. 30, 1910, p. 80; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 115; *Ibid.*, p. 504; *America*, Apr. 29, 1911.

²⁹ For an excellent account of the Central Verein, containing an allusion to its coöperation with the Catholic Social Guild of England, see Father Husslein's article in *America*, Sept. 2, 1916; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1911, p. 42. The author is indebted to Mr. F. P. Kenkel, the Director of the Central Bureau of the Catholic Central Verein of America, for some of the information in this paragraph; the quotation from Plater is to be found on p. 78 of Vol. 3-4 of the *Central-Blatt*, July, 1910.

³⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, p. 115. Cf. *Catholic Fortnightly Review*, Vol. 18 (1911), pp. 67-69.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 131-136.

³² Plater, *Priest and Social Action*, pp. 127-143.

³³ The Committee on Special War Activities, National Catholic War Council: *Social Reconstruction* (Washington, 1919), p. 5.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 9, 10; *America*, Mar. 22, 1919; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1918, *passim*.

³⁵ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. xv, p. 687. The letter, which was dated January 11, 1921, stated that the English ladies had raised objections as far back as 1916 but without avail. It is significant to note that whereas American Catholic Women have opposed the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, *Equal Rights*, the mouth-piece of the National Woman's Party, in its issue of March 27, 1926, rejoiced in the support of its propaganda for this amendment given by *The Catholic Citizen*, the organ of the St. Joan's Social and Political Alliance of England.

³⁶ *Catholic Times*, Aug. 11, 1923.

³⁷ *Commonweal*, Nov. 18, 1925.

³⁸ *Tablet*, Sept. 29, 1883.

³⁹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, pp. 145, 146.

⁴⁰ Ch. P. Sagot du Vauroux in *Le Correspondant*, Vol. 299, June 10, 1925, p. 651.

⁴¹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 20.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 1914, p. 19.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 1914, pp. 52, 53; *America*, July 12 and 19, 1913. The quotation given is to be found on p. 347, *Tablet*, July 5, 1913.

⁴⁴ *Month*, Vol. 122 (1913), pp. 277-284. See also Ada Streeter's account of the International Federation of Catholic Women's Leagues in the *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, pp. 146, 147. Miss Fletcher contributed an illuminating account of the history and achievements of the International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues to the *Catholic Woman's Outlook*, Vol. 3 (1926), pp. 2-13.

⁴⁵ *Tablet*, July 30, 1921; *Catholic News*, Nov. 14, 1925.

⁴⁶ *America*, Jan. 21, 1922.

⁴⁷ *Catholic Mind*, Vol. xxi (Aug. 22, 1923), p. 312. It was in his encyclopedic work *The Etymologies* that St. Isidore, archbishop of Seville, reserved the term "jus gentium" for what we mean by international law. Walsh, E. (edit.), *The History and Nature of International Relations* (New York, 1922), p. 76.

⁴⁸ Dr. John A. Ryan of the Catholic University of America, in an address delivered at a meeting of the World Alliance for Peace through the Churches, Detroit, Michigan, on Nov. 12, 1925, quoted from a sermon preached by a non-Catholic clergyman, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, in the Cathedral at Geneva on the occasion of the League of Nations' Assembly the previous September. Dr. Fosdick blamed the disruption of Christendom for some of the evils of the rampant nationalism so prolific of wars: "Even our religion has been nationalised; with state churches or without them, the center of loyalty in the religious life of the people has increasingly become the nation. Let Protestantism acknowledge its large responsibility for this in Western Christendom! In our fight for liberty we broke up the inclusive mother church into national churches; we reorganised the worship of the people around nationalistic ideals; we helped to identify religion and patriotism. And so far has that identification gone that now, when war breaks, the one God of all humanity, whom Christ came to reveal, is split up into little tribal deities, and before these pagan idols even Christians pray for the blood of their enemies." *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 10 (1926), p. 14.

The first Englishman to deliver the annual Assembly Sermon was the Jesuit writer, Father Martindale, who preached to the statesmen and League officials at Geneva in the autumn of 1926. He blamed the abandonment of living principles for the ills that afflict society today. The world was in need of the reassertion of high ideals and individual moral responsibility. "There is no scheme," he said, "no programme, no equilibrium of weights, no sheaf of forces, however perfectly arranged, that cannot be defeated by men who have not in them the desire to be just, to be merciful, and even self-sacrificing." *Commonweal*, Oct. 13, 1926.

⁴⁰ *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 10 (1926), p. 12; *Studies*, Vol. 7 (1918), pp. 227-242; Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-92; *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 31 (1925), pp. 371-374; *Commonweal*, July 1, 1925, pp. 203-204; Plater, *Primer of Peace and War* (New York, 1915), Appendix C; *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 21 Agosto, 1926, pp. 305-317.

⁵⁰ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, p. 151; Plater, *op. cit.*, p. 161; Urquhart, F. F., *The Law of Nations and the Vatican Council* (Oxford, 1918); *A Protestant's Appeal to the Pope* (C. S. G. Leaflet, No. 9).

⁵¹ *Tablet*, Jan. 11, 1896.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Devas, C. S., *Key to the World's Progress* (London, New York, etc., 1912), pp. 124-128.

⁵⁴ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 31; *Tablet*, Mar. 9, 1912.

⁵⁵ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1912, p. 32.

⁵⁶ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, p. 35; *Tablet*, Mar. 9, 1912. In 1912 the Institut de Droit International Chrétien held its first congress at Louvain. Leading Catholic scholars of ten different nations gave promises of assistance. The Institut likewise met with the warm approval of a number of cardinals and leading ecclesiastics. Plater, *Primer of Peace and War*, p. 162; *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913.

⁵⁷ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913, p. 35; *Universe*, May 24, 1912.

⁵⁸ *North American Review*, Vol. 196 (1912), pp. 353-363.

⁵⁹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1913.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Keating's lecture adapted for American readers was printed in 1914 by the Paulist Press, New York. The quotation is taken from p. 26 of the latter edition.

⁶¹ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1914, p. 36.

⁶² *Tablet*, Mar. 14, 1914.

⁶³ Martindale, C. C., *Charles Dominic Plater*, pp. 194-198.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 164. Plater went to London to a Westminster Catholic Federation meeting and to lead a discussion at the British Institute of Social Service on International Morality.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 235, 296; *Aberdeen Journal*, Aug. 15, 1915; *Manchester Courier*, Sept. 1, 1915; *Pall Mall Gazette*, Aug. 11, 1915; *Ulster Guardian*, Aug. 10, 1915; *Living Church*, Nov. 11, 1916. Favourable reviews also appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Birmingham Post* and the *Glasgow Herald*. The *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1915, pronounced it a work "of extraordinary merit . . . by far the ablest textbook on war from the Christian standpoint which has appeared in recent times in English."

⁶⁶ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1915, pp. 40-47. The editors heartily endorsed Mr. Urquhart's appeal and stated that the Guild had already drawn up a provisional study scheme on the Ethics of Peace and War. It had also under consideration the publication of a textbook on International Morality.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 183; C. S. G. Law of Nations Series No. 1, *The Pope's Peace Note* (1917 and 1918). In the second edition of this pamphlet, Cardinal Bourne chronicled the significant fact that since he wrote the two brief

paragraphs of the original preface, the Prime Minister of England and the President of the United States had given utterance to views on peace practically identical with those which Pope Benedict had set forth the previous August.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, No. 11, *Replies to the Pope's Appeal*; Martindale, *op. cit.*, pp. 183-184; C. S. G. Law of Nations Series, No. IV, *The Restoration of the Law of Nations*, pp. 11, 12; C. S. G. Law of Nations Series, No. VI, *The Free Seas in Peace and War*, p. 1; Martindale, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

In 1915, Monsignor B. Ward published his *Thoughts in War Time* (London). He was pessimistic regarding the possibility of the extinction of war, yet he looked to the exercise of common sense and self-restraint—as well as recourse to arbitration—to further reduce the number of armed conflicts. A year later appeared Malcolm Quin's *The Problem of Human Peace* (London). This philosophical disquisition, written from the standpoint of a Modernist, received critical notice by Canon Barry in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. 160 (1917), p. 191 *et seq.*

⁶⁹ *Times*, Sept. 9, 1918 and Oct. 31, 1918.

⁷⁰ *Universe*, Aug. 9, 1918.

⁷¹ *Studies*, Vol. 10 (1921), pp. 191-204.

⁷² *America*, Jan. 21, 1922.

⁷³ *Times*, Apr. 2, 1923; *Le Correspondant*, Vol. 293 (Oct.-Dec. 1923), p. 1059. The same number contains an excellent account of L'Union Catholique D'Etudes Internationales, pp. 1056-1071.

⁷⁴ *Catholic News*, Sept. 3, 1923.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, Oct. 27, 1923; *Tablet*, Oct. 20, 1923.

⁷⁶ *Month*, Vol. 142 (1923), p. 391.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. 143 (1924), pp. 313-321. Later in the year, Cardinal Bourne speaking on international questions said: ". . . Thanks be to God, we English people have the virtue of not cherishing hate permanently. . . . We in England have sent help to the Rhineland during the famine, and we did that to show that we made peace in earnest," *Catholic News*, Sept. 13, 1924.

⁷⁸ *Tablet*, May 24, 1924; *Commonweal*, Dec. 10, 1924.

⁷⁹ *Tablet*, May 17, 1924.

Mr. Hilaire Belloc, writing in the *Commonweal* for Jan. 28, 1925, on "A European View of the League" differentiated between the ideal and the actual machine. To the former there was a real adhesion of the European mind. As to the actuality, the following drawbacks could be enumerated: (1) It was inoperative in the most important matters because it was without armament. (2) Nations were trying to shape its policies toward their own ends. (3) It was not nationally representative, but spoke through the mouths of parliamentarians—professional politicians and their hangers-on, and (4) It did nothing as League, but only as the instrument of the policy of different nations. Snead-Cox wrote a favourable account of the League: *Dublin Review*, Vol. 164 (1919), pp. 106-127.

⁸⁰ *Catholic Times*, Aug. 16, 1924; Eppstein, J. (edit.), *Catholics and International Politics*. Summary of a Conference held at Reading, England, Oct. 12-15, 1923 (London).

⁸¹ *Tablet*, Mar. 14, 1925; *Commonweal*, April 8, 1925; *Catholic Social Year Book* for 1925, Introduction.

⁸² *Commonweal*, April 8, 1925; *Times*, April 27, 1925; *Ibid.*, April 29, 1925. Father Keating contributed two thought-provoking articles on "An International Ethic" to the April 29th and May 6th numbers of the *Commonweal* in which he brought out the reasonableness of corporate as well as individual responsibility to the moral law. The Council, as Cardinal Bourne emphasised at the London meeting, had been set up for study, not action. Its purpose was not to intervene in public policy. On that occasion he warned his hearers of the fallacy of easy solutions of international problems and gave Wilson's idea of "self-determination" as an example. Apart from the practical difficulty of determining the self-determining unit, the principle, he claimed, was historically false in so far as nations like individuals were not self-determined, but determined by a great many surrounding factors. *Tablet*, May 2, 1925.

⁸³ *Tablet*, May 2, 1925; *Ibid.*, May 9, 1925. In an article written for *Studies*, Vol. 14 (1925), pp. 207-217, Mr. Somerville said that Catholics rejoiced to see the earnestness with which non-Catholics of the highest ability were devoting themselves to the establishment of international justice. Because Catholics base the Law of Nations on the Law of Nature they would be able to coöperate with non-Catholics in this work.

⁸⁴ *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1925, p. 12; *Tablet*, May 23, 1925. General de Castelnau wrote that he was publishing Captain Eppstein's letter in *Le Bulletin de la Fédération Nationale Catholique*.

⁸⁵ *Tablet*, June 27, 1925.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1925. For an account of the origin of the I. K. A. which was founded at Gratz in Austria see the Aug. 15, 1925, number of the same paper.

⁸⁷ *Commonweal*, Aug. 26, 1925; *Ibid.*, Sept. 2, 1925; *Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 9 (1925), p. 273. *C. S. G. Bulletin*, Vol. 3 (1920), p. 108.

Mr. W. A. Mackenzie, the British member of the "Comité International" of the Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales, was made a member of a commission chosen in 1925 to concern itself with the Catholic aspects of the varied relief works of the League of Nations. The selection of Mr. Mackenzie was a very happy one because of his unremitting labours at Geneva in behalf of the most helpless and unfortunate of the victims of the European turmoil, especially the children. *Universe*, Aug. 7, 1925.

⁸⁸ *Tablet*, Aug. 15, 1925.

⁸⁹ *Commonweal*, Aug. 26, 1925; *Tablet*, Aug. 15, 1925; *Ibid.*, Aug. 22, 1925. Dr. Ryan's address was wired in its entirety by the N. C. W. C. News service to the Catholic press of the United States. It is to be found, for example, in *The Catholic News*, Aug. 22, 1925.

⁹⁰ *Universe*, Aug. 21, 1925; *Tablet*, Aug. 22, 1925; *Commonweal*, Sept. 2, 1925.

⁹¹ *America*, Aug. 8, 1925; *Tablet*, Aug. 22, 1925; *Blackfriars*, vol. vi (1925), pp. 537-540; *Catholic News*, Aug. 29, 1925; *Month*, Vol. 146 (1925), pp. 330-37; *Commonweal*, Feb. 24, 1925; *Ibid.*, Mar. 3, 1926.

When the Locarno compacts were concluded, Cardinal Bourne expressed

his pleasure in his Letter for Advent, 1925. He believed that Catholics of every land should rejoice in the arrangements that had been negotiated there. He said the terms "allied" and "enemy" country should pass into oblivion. There was, he declared, cause for thanksgiving in the increasing influence of the League of Nations.

⁷² *Catholic Social Year Book*, 1925, *passim*.

CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters have traced the growth of the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain from the Restoration of the Hierarchy to the present day. Perhaps those readers whose minds incline them to look for something very definite have been disappointed in the character of that movement. But its amorphous nature has stamped it as typically British and typically Catholic. It was the development of a social conscience amongst Catholics by which each in his own way should apply Catholic principles to concrete instances rather than the development of a regimented goose step.

There is no need to explain why such a situation may be called typically British, but a word should be added to show wherein it is typically Catholic. Although Catholics agree on certain fundamental principles, they differ frequently as to the application of these principles; they differ as to the interpretation of the facts in any concrete case. A recent instance will clarify this point. While the Trades Union Bill aiming to prevent general strikes was before Parliament, a member of the Catholic Social Guild wrote a letter which was published in the *Christian Democrat* for May, 1927, in which he asked the Guild to go on record for or against the Bill. He was convinced that the measure had a moral aspect and that the Guild was better fitted than individuals to pass a judgment upon it. In his opinion the Guild should be strong enough to expect its members to abide by its finding. The editor of the *Christian Democrat* pointed out in his brief commentary that though there might be agreement on principle, there might be differences of opinion as to facts, and the latter might be better known by the rank and file than by the teachers. He went on to say that though a legislative measure might be sound in principle, it might, in point of fact, be unnecessary and

for that reason unjustifiable. Again, it might be permissible and desirable in certain contingencies, but all such contingencies might not exist. He promised to have the Trades Union Bill discussed in the columns of his paper, but expressed his unwillingness to bind the members of the Guild to any specific point of view.

This ideal of the Catholic Social Guild is the happy culmination of a movement which began under unpropitious auspices. The small Catholic population of Great Britain spent the last years of the eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth century in a struggle for religious liberty and a recognition of citizenship. This gave them little opportunity for participation in movements for the amelioration of the rapidly accumulating social ills. The inclination was likewise absent, for the tendency of English-bred Catholics, numerous in Lancashire and scattered elsewhere, was toward aloofness from the main currents of thought and activity of their day and country. Inroads were made upon this conservatism by the influx of the converts of the Oxford Movement, and it was challenged still further by the great number of people of Irish lineage who came to form a substantial proportion of the Catholics of Great Britain.

For many years absorbing interest in Home Rule and Irish politics kept this latter group from even a sufficient interest in social questions to better their own lot. All the while, however, they were being trained in political experience and were being attracted to the progressive items of legislation which were included in the programme of the political party to which they adhered. Many branched off from Irish politics into Trade Union work and, after the Labour Party came into existence, into Labour politics. The struggle for equal state aid for Catholic schools which was especially acute in the early years of the twentieth century owed its success to a temporary alliance between Catholicism and the conservative forces in politics and social life.

For these reasons the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain was slow in getting under way. Before the formation of the Catholic Social Guild in 1909 there was no organised movement amongst Catholics for social reform. During the earlier

period Catholic social action and Catholic social thought were restricted to certain outstanding figures, like Manning, Bagshawe and Devas, whose following was small and without cohesion. At the same time strictly charitable endeavours, too numerous to mention, were springing up, and the Catholic Truth Society was beginning to publish pamphlets on social questions. Nearly a decade of the twentieth century had passed before great numbers of the Catholic people of Great Britain united in an organised movement to improve the condition of the worker and of society as a whole. This movement owed much to the experience of the Social Catholics of other nations and has been in its turn an inspiration to them. It has already begun to make its contribution to the cause of world peace.

Attention has been called to the relations between the Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain and other organised efforts for social betterment, such as Socialism, Distributivism, Guild Socialism and the British Labour Party. The Catholics of Great Britain have avoided the pitfalls which would have inevitably been theirs had they chosen to work for their social reforms through the medium of a Catholic political party. Time will probably prove that the method of non-partisan education adopted by the Catholic Social Guild has been a wise one and the best for all organised religious groups to adopt. If this prophecy fail not, there may yet be realised that form of the separation of Church and State which is admittedly the most difficult to achieve.

APPENDIX A

ARCHBISHOP BAGSHAWE OF NOTTINGHAM

Edward Gilpin Bagshawe, the third Bishop of Nottingham, who died at an advanced age in 1921, twenty years after his retirement, is frequently mentioned along with Manning and Devas as one of the Catholic social pioneers of England. A lovable character, but a poor administrator, he was preëminent rather as a theorist than a man of action. Withdrawn though he was from the main current of the Social Catholic Movement, his ideas on social justice, especially as set forth in certain Pastorals which he wrote for his flock in 1883 and 1884 were far in advance of those of other Catholic thinkers in the same field. Professor Nitti, in his book *Catholic Socialism*, wrote that Bagshawe had formulated a thorough programme of State Socialism, and M. Benedict, in an article published in the *Revue Socialiste* for December, 1885, declared that the Bishop of Nottingham's Pastorals were "de véritables manifestes du socialisme religieux." Vogelsang likewise accorded high praise to the Bishop of Nottingham's social theories.

Bagshawe's writings on social questions, especially his *Mercy and Justice to the Poor, the True Political Economy*, published in 1885, are strikingly like Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* written several years later. Like his illustrious contemporary, Bagshawe denounced the unnatural and un-Christian conditions of society under which multitudes had to live, and, like him, stressed the essential righteousness of a living wage.

Bagshawe's trenchant pamphlet was chiefly concerned with the question of social justice. He pointed out with merciless accuracy ways in which both general justice, which has for its object the general good, and particular or commutative justice, which con-

cerns the rights of individuals, were outraged under modern English social conditions. General justice, he declared, was violated by such customs as the State's permitting water-companies to make enormous profits by depriving hundreds of thousands of the London poor of water, thereby sending them to liquor shops, the unlawful seizure of recreational and common land, and the selling of adulterated and putrefying foods. Among the second class of unjust practices he instanced the rack-renting of farms and the payment of insufficient wages. Bagshawe took occasion to attack as guilty of sins against commutative justice those who tried to force above its natural level the current price of the necessities of life. This, he affirmed, might be done either by monopolistic combination, or by a method which the American economist, Thorstein Veblen, writing a generation later, stigmatised as a form of sabotage practised by the capitalistic class—the destruction of foods, or their malicious deflection from markets, for the purpose of keeping up prices.

Archbishop Bagshawe probably earned his reputation as an advanced thinker by the expression of sentiments like the following which are to be found in his *Mercy and Justice to the Poor*:

“It [the State] forces its subjects, as is done on the Continent, into military service, often with immense mischief to themselves and their families, or compels them, as here, to pay enormous sums in taxes, that it may have soldiers to fight its battles. It will wage expensive wars to protect the interests of trade. It has, indeed, small scruple in pushing its right to extremities, when the ambition or the interests of rulers or of influential classes are concerned.

“It is only when the interests of the poor and helpless are in question—of those very classes whom it is especially bound to protect and help—that the State begins to be scrupulous, and the wealthier among its subjects begin to say: ‘You must respect private property; let each one do the best he can for himself; it is not for the State to interfere, even though millions may be crushed to the dust, and left to starve by their richer neighbours: the maxims of political economy require that it should be so.’

"I do not think that the right and duty of the state, and of its citizens, are so limited as political economists appear to suppose. Their duty extends to all those necessities on the one hand, and abuses on the other, which cannot be relieved or checked without public action and legislation."

Brave words, truly, at a time when the star of Adam Smith had not yet sunk beneath the horizon, and in the decade before Leo XIII declared that "the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working classes."

Bibliographical Note.—There is no biography of Bagshawe in existence. Incidental references to him may be found in works devoted to other subjects, such as the *Catholic Encyclopedia* article on "Nottingham," and Leslie's life of Manning. In the latter, we find that Bagshawe embarrassed the English episcopate by condemning the Primrose League! Many of his own works on social questions are to be found only along the byways of research. Workhouse Papers (1861) reveal him writing to the Poor Law Board from the Brompton Oratory to protest against the exclusion of priests from the workhouses. Chief among his pastorals devoted to social questions were his pastoral letter for Advent, 1883, On the Desperate Condition of Our Poor: Its Causes and Remedies (Nottingham 1883) that for Lent, 1884, on The Duties of the State and the Rights of Labour,¹ and that for Advent of the same year, devoted to Certain Prevalent Sins of Injustice (Nottingham, 1884). The pamphlet, *Mercy and Justice to the Poor, The True Political Economy* (London 1885) was a reissuance on request of the substance of these pastorals. This pamphlet is apparently to be found only in the British Museum. Archbishop Bagshawe wrote on a variety of subjects, among which may be mentioned his *Notes on Christian Doctrine* (1896); *The Catholic Church in the Scripture* (1899); and *The Psalms and Canticles in English Verse* (1903).

¹ L'Association Catholique, vol. 18 (1884), p. 61 *et seq.*

APPENDIX B

CATHOLICS AND THE BRITISH GENERAL STRIKE

On the fourth of May, 1926, great numbers of union workers in England, Scotland and Wales went out on a general strike which was called off nine days later by the Council of the Trades Union Congress. The strike was a sympathetic one in support of the miners who had been practically locked out five days before, when, the Government subsidy to the mine industry having come to an end, wage reduction notices were posted by the owners. Conservatives and liberals, reactionaries and radicals, have given contradictory estimates of the significance of the very orderly, comparatively wide-spread, typically British stoppage of labour which followed as a protest against this action, and likewise as a manœuvre of self-defense, lest wage reductions and longer hours, starting in the mining industry, be extended to other occupations. Perhaps perspective is lacking in which the historic importance of that nine day episode can be gauged. In any case, we are here concerned only with expressions of opinion which emanated from English Catholic sources regarding the unprecedented event and the impasse in the mining industry which gave rise to it.

Mr. Justice Astbury, Sir John Simon and the Earl of Oxford and Asquith declared the General Strike illegal. Cardinal Bourne condemned it as immoral.

"There is no justification for a general strike of this character," he wrote. "It is a direct challenge to lawfully constituted authority, and inflicts, without adequate reason, immense discomfort and injury on millions of our fellow-countrymen. It is, therefore, a sin against the obedience we owe to God, who is the source of

that authority, and against the charity and brotherly love which is due to our brethren.

"All are bound to uphold and assist the government, which is the lawfully constituted authority of the country and represents, therefore, in its own sphere, the authority of God Himself."¹

The secondary sympathetic strike against employers generally is held to be normally unethical by Catholic theologians, as is the analogous weapon, the secondary boycott. Only extreme circumstances are held to justify the use of the one or the other. In the summer of 1926 the Mexican hierarchy seemed to think that such an emergency had arisen, when they counselled a boycott as a protest against the measures of the Calles Government. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, when making his pronunciamiento on the British Strike a little earlier in the same year, was evidently of the opinion that no extreme need gave moral justification for the use of so drastic a measure. Since ethically the overwhelming presumption is against the permissibility of a general strike, the burden of proof rests with those who consider it justifiable in any particular instance. The issue becomes a question of fact. On this ground five Catholic Labour M.P.'s convinced of the strength of their case addressed a letter to the Cardinal in which they declared it their duty to stand by the miners and affirmed the legality of the right to withhold labour.

"We have striven for peace," they wrote, "and peace has been denied us by the Government. . . . We therefore hold that our fellow-workers are doing what is right, and with all respect, yet with emphasis, we protest against a high dignitary of Holy Church making a statement which neither the morality nor the theology of our faith justifies."²

The crisis in the mining industry which had precipitated the General Strike did not end with the end of the strike. There is no occasion to rehearse the various comments of the Catholic press on the mining situation—Mr. Chesterton's castigation of the mine-owners in the pages of his *Weekly*, for May 1, 1926, for example,

¹ *Commonweal*, June 9, 1926.

² Fyfe, *Behind the Scenes of the Great Strike*, p. 60.

or the conservative viewpoint of the *Tablet* as contrasted with the liberal tone of the *Universe*. One opinion, however, deserves special mention, namely, that of the President of the Catholic Social Guild, Archbishop Keating of Liverpool. In *The Parishioner* for June, 1926, he made the following statement:

"If, on the one hand, the organisers of the General Strike had been the desperadoes they were supposed to be, and if, on the other hand, the Prime Minister had allowed his most militant followers to stampede him into the adoption of extreme measures, Whitsuntide would not have been a universal holiday, but the blackest of black weeks. Once more we have been saved from national disaster, not by our superior wisdom or patriotism, but by the restraint imposed by the Christian conscience on the leaders of the opposite sides. The Spirit of Christ, however vaguely apprehended, imposed 'The Truce of God' before it was too late. The only security against still more menacing outbreaks is to substitute for the modern gospel of class-hatred, the original gospel of doing to others as we would have them do to us.

" 'The Family Living Wage,' in an industrial State, is the most fundamental precept of social justice. 'What the industry can afford,' may be accepted as a fair basis for the remuneration of the higher grades of workers; but cannot be accepted as a basis for the remuneration of the lowest grade, if it should seem to entail a starvation wage. The hard fact, from which there is no escape, is this: that millions of human beings in our industrialised society have nothing whatever but their wages to subsist upon. So long as private enterprise can fulfil its primary social function of providing a family living wage for those necessitous millions, it can justify its existence. When it fails in its primary social function, it stands self-condemned; and no pleading on the score of economics can save it. The poor must live; and, if private enterprise cannot provide the worker with a living, it must clear out for another system that can. It cannot be allowed to cumber the ground.

"Our mining villages in Lancashire furnish illustrations of this argument. Everybody knows that colossal fortunes have been

made in the past out of Lancashire coal. Now-a-days, for various reasons, our coal-fields are among the least remunerative. But during the booming period large populations of colliers have settled in the neighbourhood of the pits, including a considerable proportion of Catholics. . . . In those mining villages, however unprepossessing they may appear to a stranger's eye, the native population, at all events, have found the elements of their earthly and supernatural happiness. Is all this human tackle to be lightly 'scrapped,' together with all the rest of the machinery, because the mines no longer 'pay'? Or must the miners submit to ruthless inroads upon their living wage, in order that private enterprise may be able to make it 'Pay' to employ them? The mere formulation of such questions is enough to show that economic considerations are not the sole, nor even the primary factors in the solution of these difficult problems. No doubt there will always arise desperate cases where 'a deserted village' is inevitable. But no decent country will tolerate the wholesale devastation of our mining areas, and the deportation of the inhabitants, until science and management have exhausted every resource to let the poor live where they have made their home. In an atmosphere of good-will and genuine Christian charity, the Report of the Mining Commission might yield the solution we are seeking—God grant it!"

The Socialist paper, the *Daily Herald*, drew much comfort from this message on the mining crisis. The issue of June 17, 1926, declared editorially that this was a brave pronouncement and added: "In all hearts which love justice and mercy, there will be gratitude to the Archbishop for his stirring, generous words. They are instinct with the spirit of the noblest kind of Socialism. If Mr. Baldwin would take them to heart, he might still falsify the prediction of his Harrow schoolmaster and 'do something big.'"

Bibliographical Note.—No definitive history of the Strike has been written. In addition to newspaper files and periodical literature, several small books can be consulted. Among these should be mentioned the presentation of the Government's side by The

Right Honourable Sir John Simon, M.P., *Three Speeches on The General Strike* (London, 1926), Hamilton Fyfe's *Behind the Scenes of the Great Strike* (London, 1926), the latter from the Labourist standpoint, and a commentary by the radical American labour economist, Scott Nearing, entitled *The British General Strike* (New York, 1926). Dr. Nearing's book contains a bibliography, pp. 179, 180. For the ethics of strikes, see *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. VIII, pp. 724-728, article "Labour Unions, Moral Aspect Of." Notice was taken of the Strike in the Catholic press of countries other than England. The *Catholic Charities Review* of the United States (issue of June, 1926), for example, gave a clear account of the momentous event.

INDEX

- Action Libérale Populaire, 137.
 Action Populaire, 252, 258.
 Agricultural Labourers, 49, 50.
 America, Social Catholic contacts with, 259-263.
 American Central Verein, 260, 261.
 Anti-Slavery Society, British and Foreign, 76.
 Anti-Statists. See also Distributivists, 111-117.
Appeal of a Protestant to the Pope for the Reestablishment of International Law, 269.
 Arbitration, international, 34, 257, 269, 270.
 Arbitration of labour disputes, 31, 32, 37.
 Arch, Joseph, 49, 50.
 Ashton, Father John, 108.
 Associative State, 122.
 Augustinusverein, 259.

 Bagshawe, Archbishop Edward Gilpin, 250, 251, 299-301.
 Barry, Canon William, 158, 170, 276.
 Bathhurst, Charles, 254, 255.
 Belloc, Hilaire, 9, 111-113, 118, 122, 123, 218, 260.
 Bellows, Dr. H. W., 40.
 Benedict, XV, 268, 277.
 Bénédict, M., 251, 299.
 Benson, Monsignor Robert Hugh, 272.
 Berlin, International Conference of, for consideration of social problems, 33, 34.
 Bodley, J. E. C., 68.
 Book-Boxes, 188, 189.
 Booth, Charles, 159, 181.
 Booth, General, 80, 81, 152.
 Boulton, S. B., 24, 31, 32.
 Bourne, Cardinal, 133, 136, 141, 168, 204-206, 208, 213, 216, 218, 233, 262, 266, 271, 278, 279, 281, 284, 286, 302, 303.

 Boys' Brigade, Catholic, 162.
 Boys' Clubs, Catholic, 207, 208.
 Boy Scouts, Catholic, 210.
 British Labour Party, Catholics and 98, 127-137.
 Britten, James, 207, 237.
 Brown, Monsignor, 216.
 Buharin and Preobrazhensky, on incompatibility of religion and communism, 125.
 Burns, John, 72-74, 76.
 Burns, Thomas, 132, 133, 134, 141, 204, 206.
 Buxton, Sydney, 32, 48, 73, 74.

 Capececiatro, Cardinal, estimate of Manning, 257.
 Carrington, Lord, 71.
 Casartelli, Bishop, and Catholic Trade Unionists, 205.
 Catholic Charities, National Conference of, in U. S., 260.
Catholic Church and Labour, The, 168.
 Catholic Confederation, movement for, 264, 265.
 Catholic Congresses, National, 173, 203.
 Catholic doctrine on war, 268.
Catholic Ideals in Social Life, 221, 222.
 Catholic Institute, 184.
 Catholic Literature League, 260.
 Catholic Peace Association, *The*, 271-277.
 Catholics, political duty of, 139, 140.
 Catholic Political Parties, 137-143.
 Catholic Seamen's Home and Institute, 159.
 Catholic Union, 255, 263.
 Catholic Union of International Studies, 285.
 Catholic social action on eve of War, 202-209.

- Catholic Social Guild, 12, 110, 123, 126, 143, 160-194, 203 204, 211, 258, 261, 264.
- Catholic Social Platform, A*, 229, 252.
- Catholic Social Union, 157, 164, 165.
- Catholic Social Work in Germany*, 258.
- Catholic Socialism*, 257, 299.
- Catholic Studies in Social Reform*, 186.
- Catholic Truth Society, 105; 107 108, 126, 156, 158-161, 163, 168, 172, 174, 179, 254, 259, 261.
- Catholic Women's League, 178, 212, 235, 238 258.
- Catholic Woman's Outlook*, 238.
- Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, 238, 240.
- Catholic Workers' College, 232-236.
- Catholicism and Socialism*, 108.
- Catholicism, influence on Guild Socialism, 118.
- Prospects of, in Great Britain, 8-12.
- Catholics and British Labour Party, 98, 127-137.
- Cavrois, Père, 258.
- Center Party in Germany, 137.
- Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, 261.
- Cercles d'Etudes, 171.
- Charity, attitude of English Catholics toward, 166, 167, 173, 257.
- Charity Organisation Society, 203.
- Chesterton, G. K., 9, 10, 111, 114, 115, 118, 121, 122.
- Child, hygiene, 229;—labour, 26, 35, 36, 48, 50; welfare, 47-49.
- Christian Democrat*, 111, 185.
- Christian Social Crusade, A*, 184, 185.
- Church and Eugemics, The*, 186, 231.
- Church and the Land, The*, 116.
- Church and Peace, The*, 274.
- Church and the Worker, The*, 187.
- Cole, G. D. H., 119, 122 123.
- Collectivist State, Belloc's opinion on, 113.
- Communism, 124-127.
- Community and the Criminal, The*, 185.
- Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain*, 98.
- Coöperative Movement, 28, 162.
- Correspondance Franco-Allemande, 282.
- Corrigan, Archbishop, 82, 83 225.
- Crawford, Virginia M., 163, 164, 166, 167, 177, 178, 187, 203, 232, 237, 271, 273.
- Crucible, The* 178.
- Cuthbert, Father, 132, 161, 217, 221.
- Davitt, Michael, and compensation for land, 83, 84.
- Day, Father Henry, exposition of Catholic social principles, 109.
- De Albornes, Alvaro, 255.
- Decay of Capitalist Civilisation*, 111.
- Destitution and Suggested Remedies*, 186.
- Devas Bertrand, 169, 207, 224.
- Devas, Charles Stanton, 102-106, 270.
- Dietz, Father, 261.
- Dignity and Rights of Labour, The*, 24-28.
- Dilke, Sir Charles, 49, 68.
- Distributivists, 111-117.
- Dockers' Strike, 31, 32, 60, 71-76.
- Doka, Herr, discussion of nationality, 287.
- Donelly, Father Terence, 8.
- Douglas, Major, scheme for finance under Guild Socialism, 120.
- Doutreloux, Monsignor, 251.
- Drunkenness, 60-63, 68, 154, 161.
- Dudley, Owen, interest in peace, 284.
- Economic Liberalism, 100.
- Education, 40-49, 152, 153.
- Elements of Economics*, 187.
- Emancipation Act, Catholic, 2.
- Emigration, Manning's interest in, 77.
- English Trade, Manning's theories on, 30.
- Eppstein, Captain, 257, 287.
- Fabian Society, 97, 107.
- Feeble-minded, care of, 7.
- Feminism, 231, 239, 240, 263.
- Fenianism, denunciation of, by Manning, 56.
- Fletcher, Margaret, 177, 178, 235, 237, 258, 265, 266.
- Fortey, Emily C., appeal to social workers, 202.
- Fox, Samuel F. Darwin, theory on origin of League of Nations, 278.
- France, Social Catholic Contacts with, 258.

- Frauenbund, 237, 258.
Free Seas in Peace and War, The, 277.
 Freppel, Monsignor, attack on Manning's radicalism, 250.
 Friends and Foes of Peace, *The*, 271, 272.
 Gasquet, Cardinal, 158.
 George, Henry, 81-84.
 Germany, Social Catholic Contacts with, 258, 259.
 Gerrard, Father T., theories on eugenics, 186.
 Gibbons, Cardinal, 218, 225, 260.
 Gibbs, Agnes, 177, 178, 203.
 Giesswein, Monsignor, 240, 254.
 Giffen, Robert, 29, 71.
 Gladstone and Manning, 17, 50, 56, 58.
 Goldwell, Francis, on Guild Socialism, 123.
 Görresgesellschaft, 259.
 Gorst, John, 48.
Gospel and the Citizen, The, 187.
 Great War, the, social problems arising from, 209-216.
 Green William, commendation of Leo XIII's social principles, 34.
 Grey, Earl, 57.
 Guild for Social Reform, 217.
 Guild Socialism, 118-124.
 Hardie, Keir, and Independent Labour Party, 97.
 Hop-pickers, Catholic, interest in, 169.
 Housing, 27, 65, 68-71, 155-158, 160, 180, 215, 219, 229.
How to Help the Belgian Refugees, 211.
 Hughes, Canon, interest in social questions, 220, 221.
 Husslein, Father Joseph, 229, 230, 262.
Ideals of Charity, 164, 203.
 Independent Labour Party, 107, 128.
 Individualism, results of, 1, 2.
 International Democratic Congress, First, 266, 267.
 International and Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity, discussion of, at Swanwick, 275.
 International Association for the Study of the Law of Nations according to Christian Principles, 273.
 International Catholic League, 285.
 International Office of Catholic Organisations of Rome, 285.
 International Relations, Catholic theories concerning, 275, 276, 281-288.
 International Social Action, English Catholics and, 263-267.
 Ireland, Social Catholic contacts with, 253, 254.
 Irish Immigration, influence on Catholicism in Great Britain, 5.
 Irish Land League, 55.
 Irish question, 55-60.
 Irish Sunday Closing Bill, 63.
 Italy, Social Catholic contacts with, 256-257.
 Jarrett, Father Bede, 208, 222, 284.
 Jeffery, G., and Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, 238.
 Keane, Father H., Tutor in Catholic Workers' College, 235, 236.
 Keating, Archbishop, 12, 229, 231, 263, 304, 305.
 Keating, Father J., 187, 216, 273, 274, 276, 280, 283, 287, 288.
 Kendall, M., and Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, 238.
 Ketteler, Bishop von, 108, 183, 252, 259.
Key to the World's Progress, The, 102, 270.
 Knights of Labour, attitude of Catholics towards, 84-86, 225.
 Knox, Father, on strength of Catholic Church in England, 10, 11.
Labour Claims and Industrial Peace, 217, 218.
 Labour Party, 128-137.
 Ladies of Charity, 167.
 Land Problem, in England, 28, 49, 50.
 Land question, Irish, 57-60.
 Law of Nations, pamphlets on, 277.
 League for Peace, 34.
 League of the Cross (Roman Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross), 62-64.
 League of French Catholics for International Justice, 282.

- League of Nations, 267, 278-282.
the Catholic Church and the, 283.
- Lemire, Abbé, on Manning's social theories, 21, 22, 32, 33, 60.
- Leo XIII, 27, 34-36, 59, 86, 101, 105, 115, 125, 170, 171, 186, 263, 268, 275.
- Leo Guild, 254.
- Leslie, Shane, 74, 79, 86, 226, 278, 279.
- Liberal Party, Catholic relations with, 137.
- Liquor trade, 64-67.
- Living Wage, 204, 205, 218, 229, 304
- Lucas, Father Herbert, 217.
- Manning, Cardinal, 15-89, 249-251, 269.
- Macdonald, Ramsay, 95, 98, 130, 131, 141.
- McFadden, Annie, 236.
- McGlynn, Dr. Edward, 82-84, 225.
- McNabb, Father Vincent, see also *Distributivists*, 110, 111, 115-117, 131, 185, 271, 272.
- Martindale, Father Cyril C., 171, 175, 176, 187, 216, 220, 277.
- Marxism, Catholic opposition to, 98.
- Meynell, Alice, 239.
- Milligan, George, 182, 204, 210, 211, 254.
- Mooney, Dr., views on Socialism, 107.
- Mun, Albert de, 21, 86, 108, 138, 249.
- Municipal Socialism, Devas' views on, 106.
- National Association for Promoting State-directed Colonisation, 77.
- Nationalisation, G. K. Chesterton on, 114.
- Nationalism, 270, 271, 276, 281.
- Nationality, Catholic attitude towards, 286, 287.
- Nation's Crisis, The*, 213.
- Newman, Cardinal, 2, 3, 15, 16.
- Newport, Bishop of, 68.
- Nightingale, Florence, 79, 80.
- Nitti, Francesco, 108, 251, 257, 299.
- Nolle, Dom Lambert, 178.
- Norris, Father John, 169.
- Northampton, Bishop of, 10, 133, 189, 229. See also Keating, Archbishop.
- Nugent, Father James, and work for total abstinence, 62, 153, 208.
- Oates, Austin, 157.
- O'Connor, Arthur J., 107.
- O'Hea, Father Leo, 126, 127, 234.
- O'Sullivan, Professor, 286, 287.
- Oxford Movement, 3, 7.
- Ozanam, Frederic, 86, 115, 202.
- Parkinson, Monsignor, 172, 174, 177, 179, 180, 182, 186, 187, 227, 258.
- Peace Movement among European Catholics, 281, 282.
- Pensions, old-age, 158, 159.
- Penty, Arthur, 117-120.
- Permissive Bill, 60, 61, 65.
- Pius IX, 3, 100, 101.
- Plater, Father Charles Dominic, 121, 167, 169, 170, 174-177, 180, 212, 213, 217, 232, 251-254, 275, 276.
- Poor Law, Elizabethan, 1, 30, 31.
- Poor Law Reform, 138, 139, 229.
- Poor, relief of, 70, 71.
- Popular Party, in Italy, 138.
- Population, Catholic, 8.
non-Catholic, 10.
- Poverty, opinions of Vincent McNabb in regard to, 115.
- Priest and Social Action, The*, 181, 258, 259.
- Primer of Peace and War*, 276.
- Primer of Social Science*, 177, 187, 260.
- Private property, attitude of Catholics toward, 37, 100, 110.
- Problem of Peace, Catholics and the, 287, 288.
- Progress and Poverty*, and the Index, 84.
- Prostitution, 214-216.
- Quarterly Bulletin*, 185.
- Questions of the Day*, 187.
- Quinlan, May, 162.
- Race and Nationality, Catholic Principles Concerning, 285-287.
- Reading, Conference at, 280.
- Reckitt, Maurice B., economic theories of, 117.
- Reform Act of 1918, 217, 239.
- Rerum Novarum*, 34-36, 101, 125.
- Retreats for Workers, 169-171, 260.
- Richardson, Father Richard, 161.
- Rickaby, Father Joseph, 108, 219.
- Right of Association, Manning's theories on, 25.

- Robinson, Gertrude, views on League of Nations, 277.
- Ruskin, Devas' opinions of his economic theories, 102.
- Ruskin College, 234, 235.
- Ryan, Dr. James H., 263, 286.
- Ryan, Dr. John A., 110, 218, 261.
- St. Antonino and Mediaeval Economics*, 208.
- Saint Catherine Welfare Association, 263.
- Saint Joan's Social and Political Alliance, 238-240.
- Saint Vincent de Paul, Society of, 159, 168, 173.
- Salford, Bishop of, 162, 208, 265, 274. See also Casartelli.
- Salvation Army, Manning's attitude towards, 80.
- Sangnier, Marc, 225, 252, 267.
- Scotland, Catholics of, 6, 7.
- Seamen, welfare of, 159.
- Servile State, Belloc on, 113. Cole on, 122.
- Settlement Work, Catholic progress in, 162.
- Shaftesbury, Lord, 69, 76, 80.
- Shop Steward Movement, 128.
- Slavery, Manning's views on, 76, 77.
- Smyth-Digott, Blanche, on position of woman, 239.
- Snow, Abbot, on relations of Church and labour, 168, 169, 240.
- Snowden, Philip, Archbishop White-side's attitude toward, 99.
- Social Democratic Federation, 97, 107.
- Social Literature, 183-189.
- Social Movement, Catholics and the, Parkinson on, 172.
- Social principles, pamphlets on, 185, 186.
- Social Problem, nature of, 208.
- Social Purity Crusade, 77.
- Social Reconstruction after the War, programme for, 262.
- Social reform on Catholic lines, 229.
- Social unrest, problems of, 219.
- Social Work for Layfolk*, 168.
- Socialism, 94-101, 125, 130, 131; Belloc's attacks on, 112, 113, Devas' theories on, 105, 106; English Catholics and, 106-111.
- Socialism from the Christian Standpoint*, 109.
- Socialist Movement, The*, praise by Vincent McNabb of, 131.
- Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Manning's support of, 47.
- Some Ways and Means of Social Study*, 164.
- Somers, Father Edward, on temperance, 208.
- Somerville, Henry, 109-111, 124, 134, 180, 182, 183, 210, 219, 223, 224, 230, 233, 235, 284.
- Spain, Social Catholic contacts with, 255, 256.
- State Intervention, Bagshawe on, 300, 301; Manning on, 26-28.
- Statistics, Devas on use of, 103, 104.
- Stead, W. T., and Social Purity Crusade, 77.
- Strachey, Lytton, characterisation of Manning, 19.
- Strike, General, British Catholics and, 302-306.
- Strikes, ethics of, in War Time, 210, 211.
- Studies of Family Life*, 102.
- Study Circles, 189-194, 238, 254, 261, 262.
- Study Clubs for Working Men, 169, 171, 172.
- Sturzo, don, leader of Popular Party in Italy, 138, 256.
- Summer schools of Catholic Social Guild, 219.
- Sweated Labour and the Trade Boards Act*, 186.
- Taschereau, Cardinal, 85, 225.
- Temperance, 60-68, 79, 153-155, 161, 208, 257.
- Temperance Council of the Christian Churches, 214.
- Textbooks, for Study Clubs, 187.
- Thurston, Father Herbert, on Catholic population, 7, 8.
- Toke, Leslie A. St. L., 164-166, 174, 178, 182.
- Toniolo, Giuseppe, 256.
- Trade Unionism, Catholics and, 127, 128, 132, 206, 207.
- Trades Union Congresses, 130, 132.
- Trotsky, Leon, 98, 99, 112.

- Ullathorne, Archbishop, 6.
 Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales, L', 279, 285.
 Unione Leonina, 252.
 Unionist Party, Catholic relations with, 137.
 Urquhart, David, on international peace, 269.
 Urquhart, Francis, 219, 235, 276, 277, 284.
- Vaughan, Father Bernard, 108, 109, 162, 164, 209, 217, 220.
 Vaughan, Cardinal, 38, 152-160, 227, 250, 269.
 Victoria, Queen, and social reform, 81.
 Vivisection, Manning's opposition to, 78.
 Vogel song, attitude toward Bagshawe's social theories, 251.
 Volksverein, 258, 259.
 Voluntary schools, 44, 45.
- Walsh, Archbishop, 83, 86, 87.
War on Waste, The, 212.
 Ward, William George, 3, 17, 228.
 Waugh, Benjamin, 47.
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, 98, 111, 129, 134, 140, 141.
 Wheatley, John, 99, 110, 135.
 White, Arnold, 77.
 White Slave Traffic, 266. See also Prostitution and Social Purity Crusade.
 Whiteside, Archbishop, 99, 133, 134, 180, 182.
 Whitley, J. H., and industrial arbitration, 128.
 Willis, Ambrose, 260, 261.
 Windthorst, 137, 259, 263.
 Wiseman, Cardinal, 3-5, 40, 152.
 Woman's Institute, 203.
 Women and Children, employment of, 35, 36.
 Women, English Catholic, distinctive work of, 237-240.
 Woodlock, Thomas F., 260.
 World Peace League of the White Cross, 281, 282.
 Wright, Father Thomas, 192, 207.
- Year Books, Catholic Social, 132, 180, 183-185, 209, 276, 287.
 Young Men's Society, Catholic and Party Politics, 142.
- Zanetti, Frances, 163, 237.

DATE DUE			
DEF 3-1-70			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

~~DEC 31 1970~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

83339
McEntee, G.P.

282.4208 S

M155

McE

AUT

Th

TIT

The social Catholic move-

ment in Great Britain

282.4208 S

M155

83339

